Vol. IX. No. 2 APR.—JUNE, 1961.

TAMIL CULTURE

JOURNAL OF THE ACADEMY OF TAMIL CULTURE

CONTENTS

Rs. 7 yearly

TAMIL CULTURE

ACADEMY OF TAMIL CULTURE

(See inside page of back cover for names of members of the Governing Council)

AN APPEAL

We have pleasure in inviting you and your friends to subscribe to *Tamil Culture* a quarterly journal in English published by the Academy of Tamil Culture, Madras. This journal is in its ninth year of publication and aims at reaching as wide a circle of readers as possible. It has been well-received in Universities and literary circles interested in Tamil studies and general culture. We have received numerous letters of appreciation about the journal the object of which is to promote the study and development of the Tamil language and literature, the Tamil arts and Tamil Research.

The Editorial Board of the Journal and its contributors include prominent scholars in various fields of Tamil studies both at home and abroad. It is our intention to maintain the quarterly journal as a standard journal in English through the medium of which both the non-Tamil world and the Tamil world may come to appreciate and study Tamil Culture. The annual subscription to the journal is Rs. 7/- only and we shall be grateful if you are already a member to renew your subscription to the journal, (if not done so), and ask your friends and acquaintances also to subscribe to it. We shall deem it a service done to our language and culture.

All members of the Academy will receive the quarterly free. The subscription for ordinary member is Rs. 50/- per annum and for Associate Member is Rs. 10/- per annum. College lecturers and teachers may become members by paying the subscription at half the above rates.

We request you to kindly co-operate with the Academy in procuring a wide circulation for *Tamil Culture.*

Xavier S. Thani Nayagam

Chief Editor.

Rao Sahib K. Kodandapani Pillai

Mr. C. Amritaganesan

Dr. S. Shankar Raju Naidu

Hony. Secretaries.

AN APPEAL

Dr. Kamil Zvelebil, of the Oriental Institute in Prague, who is in charge of the collective work of a Czechoslovak-Soviet team of Dravidianists who prepare a historical grammar of the Tamil language, requests all Tamil scholars, teachers, cultural workers, writers etc. who are aware of serious papers and articles published in India within the last 50 years on different problems of TAMIL LANGUAGE, its grammar and development, to send bibliographic data (author's name, title of the paper, number of pages, date and place of publication) concerning those articles to the address :

Dr. Kamil Zvelebil,
Oriental Institute, Czechoslovak Academy,
Praha 1-Mala Strana,
Lazenska 4.

Authors are requested to send off-prints of their papers if possible. The information will be used during the work of the compilation of a historical grammar of Tamil, and the names of those who will kindly meet the request will be gratefully mentioned by the compilers.

Scholars complying with the above request may also kindly send copies of their letters to Dr. Zvelebil to the Secretary, Academy of Tamil Culture, 13/11, Jeremiah Road, Vepery, Madras-7.

Vol. IX. No. 2 APR.—JUNE, 1961.

TAMIL CULTURE

JOURNAL OF THE ACADEMY OF TAMIL CULTURE

CONTENTS

Rs. 7 yearly

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

Dr. A. Chidambaranatha Chettiar is Chief Editor, English-Tamil Dictionary, University of Madras.

Dr. Arno Lehmann is University Professor, Halle (Saale) G 2, Kirschbergweg-18.

Dr. C. R. Sankaran is an eminent research scholar of the Deccan College Research Institute, Poona, and he has been appointed as Richard-Merton visiting Professor in the Institute of Phonetics and Communications research of the Bonn University, West Germany.

Mr. V. K. Sivaprakasam is teacher, Hartley College, Point Pedro, Ceylon.

Mr. M. Andronov is of the Institute of Oriental Studies, Academy of Science, U.S.S.R. (Moscow).

Rev. Fr. H. S. David is Director of Oriental Studies, St. Patrick's College, Jaffna, Ceylon.

Dr. Kamil Zvelebil is the Head of the Department of Dravidiology, University of Prague. He has translated many Tamil works into Czech and is an indefatigable research worker.

Thiruvalluvar's Message to the World *

DR. A. CHIDAMBARANATHA CHETTIAR

Thiruvalluvar, one of the greatest of Tamil poets and thinkers who lived somewhere between the first century B.C. and the first century A.D. has given to the world his monumental work, *Thirukkural* (consisting of 1,330 couplets) which is of perennial interest to the nations of the world. The work has been translated into several important languages of the world. Close students of *Thirukkural* like Dr. G. U. Pope, Mr. Ellis and Rev. H. A. Popley have paid glowing tributes to the author and have stated that the *Thirukkural* is a beacon light for the world. Scholars like Dr. Albert Schweitzer have acclaimed the work as a marvellous treatise on ethics, which while laying emphasis on self-affirmation instead of on self-negation shows to the world how people should love one another, revere one another and understand one another. On the foundations of understanding, tolerance, love and reverence for life, the edifice of the Unity of Mankind is to be erected. Thiruvalluvar has done a great deal to pave the way for Universal Brotherhood, Peace and Plenty.

Though the work was written nearly 2,000 years ago, it is of great interest in the modern world too. Some salient points alone can be touched in this paper.

Thiruvalluvar has the message that one can either be a householder or an ascetic and one can prosper as well as the other and attain bliss. Sometimes, stray verses from *Thirukkural* are cited to show that Thiruvalluvar placed the life of an ascetic over and above the life and doings

* A paper presented at the XXV International Congress of Orientalists at Moscow, August, 1960.

of a man pursuing domestic life. Yet one can cite authority for the other view also. For instance, in *Kural* 48 he says that the householder who, not swerving from virtue, helps the ascetic in his way of life, endures more than those who endure penance. In *Kural* 38 he says that he who suffers no day to pass without doing some good turn to others will by such conduct permanently block future births.

He has laid stress on the attitude of the heart rather than on the externals of religion. In *Kural* 34 he says whatever is done with a spotless mind is virtue ; all else is vain show. In another place (in *Kural* 280) he says that there is no use of a shaven crown or of tangled hair, if one abstains from such deeds as the wise have derided.

The message of Thiruvalluvar is not pessimistic but optimistic. He has asked us to brave dangers and to stand fast. More than this, he has asked us to be cheerful under adverse circumstances. (See for instance *Kural* 621 — If troubles come, simply laugh ; there is nothing like laughter which can overcome sorrow.) In another place, he pities people who cannot be cheerful at all. In *Kural* 999 he says, "To those who cannot rejoice, the whole world is buried in darkness even in broad daylight." One of the ways in which one can be cheerful is to avoid wrath. He asks in Kural 304, "Are there greater enemies than wrath, which would crush laughter and joy ?"

Sometimes, Thiruvalluvar is looked upon as having underlined the inexorable nature of fate. Though in a chapter (Chap. 38), he has stressed the importance of fate and though in the concluding couplet of that chapter he has asked "What is stronger than fate ? If an expedient to avert it is thought of, it will intrude through that expedient itself." It is significant that in other places he has held up the free will of man (as in Chap. 62 on Manly Effort), where in the concluding couplet he says, "They who strive hard without fatigue or desperation or delay

will vanquish fate and throw it out." In four chapters, especially (Chapters 60 to 63 entitled "On Enthusiasm, Against Idleness, On Manly Effort, On Perseverance in spite of Difficulties"), he has laid great emphasis on the free will of man and has removed the misconception that man is God's sport and that all his doings have been pre-ordained or pre-determined. To him, fate is sometimes esoteric but never inexorable.

In the chapter on "Enthusiasm" for instance, Thiruvalluvar states that the property or possession to be prized for is enthusiasm, since people who are destitute of that cannot possess anything at all. To be enthusiastic in mind and to be energetic in body is a great gift. All other possessions like the possession of wealth pass away and abide not. People who are agile and enthusiastic never say, "I have lost my property". Persons who persevere to their utmost will be sought after by wealth. Thiruvalluvar wants everyone to have high ambitions and glorious aspirations in life. It does not matter to him if the object sought for sometimes will not materialise. It is enough to have thought nobly and aimed high. It is only people who sweat and labour and persevere that can be liberal and generous to others in gifts. In the modern world also, this is found to be quite true. It is only nations like the American, Russian and the British who have consolidated their economic position that can go to the help of the under-developed or undeveloped countries. Enthusiasm is itself wealth, according to the learned sage. "Those that do not have that wealth are only trees in the shape of man."

In the chapter entitled "Against Idleness", this sage has said in unmistakable terms that people who are idle lose everything in the world and are a burden to themselves and to the nation. People who want their families to become illustrious or prominent should shun idleness in every sphere of their activities. Sometimes, if a person belongs to a great family but he is himself lethargic, then

the whole family is ruined. Procrastination, forgetfulness, laziness and slumber are the things which ultimately lead persons to ruin. If laziness is nurtured either in a home or in a nation, that home or that nation becomes ultimately a slave to enemies. If a man conquers idleness the reproach that would have been his otherwise would disappear.

In the next chapter (Chap. 62) on "Manly Effort", the poet has exhorted the nations to be smart and enterprising. He is one of the great thinkers of the world who have been of the opinion that the best way to attain greatness is not to regard anything as impossible under the sun. If one strives hard, one is sure to make possible even the supposedly impossible things. One should not do things in a half-hearted way; one should exert oneself to the full, for the world will abandon those who leave their work unfinished. It is only those that are alert and agile that can be proud of being helpful to others, because generosity of a man who does not strive hard will be of little worth like the manliness of a hermaphrodite who brandishes a sword. On the other hand, if people are engrossed in their work with the thought that the path of glory is not a bed of roses, they will be able to prop up and support their kith and kin. Manly effort makes a wealthy man; lack of effort means poverty. Not to be born in a fortunate family is no sin, but to be devoid of manly effort is a thing of disgrace. Even though one is not ordained by fate to secure a particular thing, if one makes an honest and earnest effort, that itself is a sure step towards success. And sometimes, a man who is of strong manly effort, even if he is not as fortunate as his brothers or brethren to reap quick benefits or to become suddenly great or wealthy, is sure to receive at least his due wages. Probably, on occasions he may not be able to achieve spectacular distinction or reward. But, persons who undauntedly labour and work hard can conquer fate, even if fate has willed otherwise.

Thiruvalluvar wants us to laugh, as pointed before, even amidst great dangers, for that is the only way in which dangers or sorrows can be overcome. People who do not sorrow in the midst of sorrow actually torment sorrow. Just as a bullock while drawing a cart through deep mire and sand struggles hard against all difficulties by lowering its very nose near to the earth, by bending its knees, and by pulling hard, people who want to become great should not hesitate to encounter difficulties in their way. If troubles come even in quick succession, the brave man should never be daunted by them. Even in the midst of happiness and joy, the person, who has cultivated a disposition to think that after all sorrow is the lot of man, never becomes troubled in mind. Anyone who regards even troubles and distresses as pleasure becomes great and is sometimes worshipped by his own enemies. This has become true in various continents and climes where great leaders of thought and leaders in political life have sacrificed their lives for holding aloft the torch of learning and for keeping the flag of their country flying high.

Thiruvalluvar has devoted a fine chapter to "Agriculture". He says that agriculture, though a laborious profession, is the most excellent one, because all other professions will not survive if there is no production of food. Agriculturists are more or less a linch-pin of the world and are the support of other toilers who cannot till the soil. It can be said that those that live on agriculture alone lead a proper life; all others may be regarded as carrying on a cringing and dependent life. Patriotic farmers are able to bring other states and nations under the umbrella of their country. Even the ascetics who abhor possessions and do not apparently have desire for anything will suffer, if the farmers do not do their duty. Thiruvalluvar has laid great stress on manuring. "Manuring is better than ploughing, and after weeding, watching is better than watering". The agriculturist who lives nearer to his farm is sure to reap better benefits than the

one who is an absentee landlord. This proximity to the field of operation has been emphasised by Thiruvalluvar as follows: "If the owner does not personally attend to his cultivation, his land will behave like an angry wife and languish". In a jocular way, he further remarks that the Lady-Earth will laugh at the sight of those who say that they have nothing of their own and go about begging. The idea is that Mother-Earth wants her sons and daughters to apply themselves to agricultural operations in order that poverty might be abolished and plenty might be ushered in.

To the nations of the world, Thiruvalluvar, if he were alive today, would say, "How in the face of imminent danger of wholesale destruction of life rendered possible by the release of 'A' bombs and 'H' bombs and other violent means of destruction you are thinking in terms of conquering other nations and annexing their territories?" In fact, in the chapter on "Instability of Life" (Chap. 34 verse 7) he said, "Innumerable millions of thought occupy the minds of those people who do not even know whether they will be alive the next moment." Though every individual and nation should work hard and earn and spend and be happy, this should not be at the expense of another and should not be to the detriment of others. He has said, "Whatever comes in the right way is good. And whatever comes in an unnatural way or wrong way is bad". There is pleasure and happiness in things derived through virtue, and agony in regard to things obtained by wickedness, cruelty and slaughter.

He never bases his codes of conduct or ethics on principles of caste or creed. His is a work intended for the whole world without any bar of colour, caste or creed. Hundreds are the occasions when he speaks in his work about the world, the world's inhabitants and their welfare. His is a work not for one country or clime but is intended to be followed by all the nations of the world, as Dr. G. U. Pope once put it.

His chapter on "Good Conduct" (Chap. 14) is a monumental contribution to the thought of the world. In that chapter, he exhorts us to be of good conduct, for good conduct elevates man. Consequently, it has to be nurtured more carefully than wealth. The soul has no other comrade than good conduct to go with it, and therefore propriety of conduct is to be jealously guarded. People born in supposedly higher communities lose their greatness if they are not of proper conduct. "The envious man loses his greatness or eminence". The proprieties of life are to be observed firmly, because transgression means misery. "Good conduct is the seed of virtue; evil ways of life perpetually cause sorrow". A test of greatness lies in finding out whether a man, despite being eminent, talks evil things. Having learnt several arts and sciences of the world, if one has not got to know how to conduct oneself agreeably in the world, one's learning is absolutely of no avail.

These few words, I hope, will serve as an incentive to know more about the great Tamil saint, scholar and poet, Thiruvalluvar, whose memory lives green in the minds of over 35 millions of people in the Tamil country.

The German Contribution to Tamil Studies

DR. ARNO LEHMANN

This short theme mentions two facts which are hardly known to German Indologists, i.e. Dravidology and the work done by Germans in the field of Tamil studies and Tamil translations. It is a fact that to many people Indology seems to center around Sanscrit. And so Dravidology has been overlooked and the rich literature we have in the spoken languages of the people has not been taken cognisance of. It may be that the near future will bring a change in this respect. The fact to be noted is, after all, that in modern India the spoken languages are highly honoured and that even new States are being formed on the basis of language. It is K. M. Panikkar who in his *Survey of Indian History* has drawn our attention to the mine of wealth to be found in the Vaishnavite and Saivite Tamil literature.[1] He says that any comparison between the literature in Sanscrit and in the spoken languages of the people will show that the latter is of a naturalness and beauty and reflecting a living faith, while the former under the heavy weight of its literary tradition turned out to become more and more removed from reality and even artificial having lost the intimate connection with actual life and social and spiritual aspirations and movements.[2] In this connection he mentions Tulsidas (1532-1623) and calls him "the poet of India". Though he was a Sanscrit scholar he much preferred to write in a living people's language! While explaining this he called his language an earthen vessel containing amrit.[3] Already some 30 years ago Professor Sylvain Levi begged the world to

[1] K. M. PANIKKAR: *Geschichte Indiens*, 1957, p. 127.
[2] *ibid.*, p. 184.
[3] *ibid.*, p. 232.

note the "enormous contribution of Tamilnad towards the culture of All-India". It would be good if many would realise the truth of the words of his disciple Dr. Charls Fabri who wrote: "By and by people will have to see and to acknowledge that Tamil literature is as important as the Sanscrit literature".[4]

It was about this Tamil that the Rev. J. E. Grundler, one of the earliest Tranquebar missionaries, wrote on 15-1-1715 that in his opinion it was worthy to be taught at German universities[5] (which at present is verified, however, at Halle/S where the present writer does teach Tamil). In the field of the Tamil language very early and very important contributions were made by German missionaries.

It would be unfair not to mention that also representatives of other nations have done some excellent work, though later, for example, the Italian C. J. Beschi, the Englishman G. U. Pope, the Irishman Caldwell, the Swede H. Frykholm and the Dane H. Jensen who gave us the English translation of 3,644 "Tamil Proverbs".[6] In John Murdoch's *Classified Catalogue of Tamil Printed Books* may be noted what on the whole has been done in the field of translations and printing.[7]

It is well to remember that almost all of these authors had come to know Tamil and to do this work because of their missionary obligations. Excepting the Indologist Eugen Hultzsch of Halle/S., who was the editor of the *Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum* it also holds true of the German students and translators of Tamil: they too were in the service of the mission i.e., the Tranquebar Mission. Even the very first theologian, Bartholomäus Ziegenbalg,

4 *Bulletin der Indischen Botschaft*, Bonn, May 1959, p. 23.

5 *Mallesche Berichte*, I, p. 861.

6 NERMAN JENSEN: *A Classical Collection of Tamil Proverbs* Madras/London, 1897.

7 J. MURDOCH: *A Classified Catalogue of Tamil Printed Books*. Madras, 1865.

who landed on the 9th of July 1706 at Tranquebar, turned out to be the very first German Dravidologist and thus the prototype of his successors. He was really at home in this language ; he is said to have spoken it as well as his mother-tongue " and like a native Malabarian ".[8] B. Ziegenbalg went on reading and reading Tamil. Some books he went over a hundred times, and even while dining he would listen to the reading of Tamil texts. He was not a narrow-minded man : he read books of theological, historical, philosophical, philological and also medical contents.[9] In his *Bibliotheca Malabarica* of August 1708 which was re-discovered at Halle in 1958[10] he lists the 161 books he had read giving the titles and the contents thus offering a most valuable contribution towards the history of Tamil literature.

One of his greatest deeds was the attempt to write a Tamil dictionary which happened to become the basis and source of other dictionaries to follow and especially of the so-called Tranquebar Dictionary.[11] Already after two years of study he in his dictionary had 20,000 words and phrases, and after another four years he had collected 40,000 words. His *Lexicon Poeticum* contained "17,000 words which are hardly understood by the common man but by scholars only ".[12] This work alone served to earn the thanks and admiration of philologists and indologists. But even more so his *Grammatica Damulica* of 1715 which was printed in 1716 at Halle/S. (!). It was this grammar which 123 years later was used by the famous Friedrich Ruckert when he had to study Tamil in order to teach

---

8 B. ZIEGENBALG : "*Ausführlicher Bericht*" vom 22.8.1708. HALLE MDCCX, p. 31. *KurzgefaBte Missions-Geschichte aus Ostindien*. Halle 1740, p. 172.

9 ARNO LEHMANN : *Alte Briefe aus Indien*, Berlin 1957, pp. 71-82.

10 ARNO LEHMANN : *Bibliotheca Malabarica, eine wieder entdeckte Handschrift.*

Wissenschaftl. Zeitschrift der Martin-Luther-Universitat, Halle-Wittenberg. Ges.-Sprachw. VIII, 4/5 pp. 903-906. Juni 1959.

11 *A Dictionary of Tamil and English*, Last ed. Tranquebar 1933, pp. 910.

12 ARNO LEHMANN : *Alte Briefe aus Indien*, p. 86.

Tamil.[13] Later on the German theologians Fabrizius, Rhenius, Graul and Beythan worked on Tamil Grammar.[14]

We leave aside here all the purely theological works and translations of Ziegenbalg[15] and turn to his indological books. These three indological books had a rare fate : in Europe they were not valued and even lost, but it was only after 154, 215 and 222 years respectively that they were discovered again and printed. These are the *Genealogie der Malabarischen Gotter* (Genealogy of the Malabarian Gods), Madras, 1867, pp. 290 ; *das Malabarische Heidenthum* (Malabarian Religion), Amsterdam 1926, pp. 292 ; and B. Ziegenbalg's *Kleinere Schriften* (Smaller Writings), Amsterdam, 1930, pp. 87. These early and thorough descriptions of South-Indian Hinduism were based on careful studies. Ziegenbalg assures his readers that he did not simply quote other authors but that he himself got the material from discussions, earnest studies, conversations and source-books only.[16]

In the *Malabarian Religion* he disclosed the "principles and doctrines in theology and philosophy" of Hinduism. In the 26 chapters of the first part he writes about "what the Tamilians believe and teach"; he deals with their books, gods, virtues and the conception of sin, temples and festivals, priests, devils etc. The second part in 18 chapters then describes the chronology and the castes,

---

13 L. ALSDORF : *Deutsch — Indische Geistesbeziehungsn.* 1942, p. 57/8.

14 C. T. E. RHENIUS : *A Grammar of the Tamil Language,* Madras, 1853, 295 pp.
CH. GRAUL : *Outline of Tamil Grammar,* Leipzig, 1855, pp. 101.
H. BEYTHAN : *Praktische Grammatik der Tamilsprache,* Leipzig, 1943, pp. 225.

15 Lists are found in :
ARNO LEHMANN : *Es begann in Transquebar,* 2 ed. Berlin, 1956, Note 27 pp. 319-321 ;
ARNO LEHMANN : *Halle und die südindische Sprach — und Religionswissenschaft,* *Wiss. Zeitschr. der Martin-Luther-Universitat* Halle 'Wittenberg, Ges.-Sprachw. Reiche Nr. 2, II/1952/53, Heft 3 Note 18, p. 156.

16 *Malabarisches Neidenthum,* Editor : W. Caland. Amsterdam 1926, p. 15.

ceremonies and agriculture, physics and medicine, art and chemistry, poetry and poets, music and astrology, ethics and the art of soothsaying, their warfaring etc.

The *Genealogy of Malabarian Gods* is a book of 290 printed pages, and yet its manuscript had been written between the 27 March and the 31 May 1713 ; a magnificent piece of work in so short a time ! Ziegenbalg knew that with this book he was to offer " a complete genealogy of gods " the like of which had never until then seen the light of day. In it he writes about " the gods, their origin, form and qualities, the many names they have, their families, their functions and deeds, their appearances and avatars and abodes, pagodas, servants and holy men, their books, days of feasting and fasting, and the sacrifices offered in and outside the temples ".[17] These two books are even today mines of wealth or, in Tamil : Kalvikkalanchiam ! Ziegenbalg had been named an " ice-breaker ".[18] And this he was, especially as he was the first European to translate a Tamil text into an European language. These translations we find in his *Smaller Writings*.[19] He translated into German *Nidi Wenpa, Kondei Wenden* and *Ulaga Nidi*.[20]

When Ziegenbalg wrote the books mentioned and even translated from Tamil into German he wanted " to serve the much beloved Europe ", and he also desired to fight against the then prevailing idea (based on entire ignorance !) that " the Malabarians were a barbaric nation without scholarship and moral virtues ". He himself had learned " to have better ideas ".[21] He also thought of

17 *Genealogte der Malabarischnen Gotter,* Editor : W. GERMANN. Madras, 1867, p. 1.

18 F. MERKEL : *Ein vergessener Religionsforschsr, Forschungen* und Fortschritte. 9. Jahrg., Nr. 16. Berlin 1-6-1933, pp. 234/5.

19 B. Ziegenbalg's *Kleinere Schriften,* Editor : W. CALAND. Amsterdam 1930.

20 ARNO LEHMANN : *Es begann in Tranquebar,* 1956, p. 55.

21 B. ZIEGENBALG : *Malabarisches Neidenthum,* pp. 11 and 61 ; Kleinere Schriften, pp. 11 and 25.

helping his successors, to serve them as an eye-opener and to make their work easier — though sometimes he felt that his work was not a mere joy but also a plague.[22]

To Ziegenbalg's contemporary colleague J. E. Grundler we owe thanks for his treatise on *The Malabarian Medicus.* In this paper he collects what the Tamilians had done in the field of medicine. With it he wants to be of service to the European medical men.[23] The original manuscript is still with us at the Mission Archives at Halle/S.

The next man to be mentioned as Dravidologist and translator of prime merit is Karl Graul. His outstanding work is the *Bibliotheca Tamulica sive Opera praecipua Tamuliensium.*[24] The first of the four volumes contains in 203 pages the German translation of *Tria opera Indorum philosophiam orthodoxam exponentia*, i.e. Kaivalyanavanita, Pancadasaprakarana and Atmabodaprakasika. Vol. II, of 174 pages, contains a fine printing of the Tamil text of Kaivalyanavanita and its translation into English so as to serve also the English speaking students of Tamil. Added are a Tamil Glossary and grammatical annotations. Vol. III, of 196 pages, is also very important : The *Kural* of Tiruvalluvar, " the jewel of the whole of Tamil literature " is translated into German ! And Vol. IV is even more wonderful : it contains the Tamil text of the *Kural* and

---

22 B. ZIEGENBALG : *Malabar. Neidenthum*, p. 12 ; *Genealogie der Malabar. Götter*, p. 3.

23 ARNO LEHMANN : *Nallesche Mediziner und Medizinen am Anfang der deutsch-indischen Beziehungen, Wiss. Zeitschr. der Martin-Luther-Universitat*, Halle-Wittenberg. Math.—Nat. Jahrg. V, Heft 2, pp. 117-132.

24 KARL GRAUL : *Bibliotheca Tamulica*

I. *Tamulische Schriften zur Erlauterung des Vedanta Systems.* Leipzig, 1854, pp. 203.

II. Kaivaljanavanita. A Vedanta Poem. Leipzig-London, 1855. pp. 174.

III. Der Kural des Tiruvalluvar, Ein Gnomisches Gedicht, Leipzig-London, 1856, pp. 196.

IV. Kural of Tiruvalluvar, High Tamil Text. Leipzig, 1865, pp. 335.

below the same text in common Tamil, and in addition a translation into Latin. Grammatical notes and a glossary are added. Hardly known are two more of his translations which were published in the *Zeitschrift der Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, 1854 and 1857. There we find *Sivajnanasittiyar* and Nampi's *Akapporul.*

My predecessor Professor Dr. H. W. Schomerus is the next in the line of German Dravidologists. In 1912 appeared his *Caiva-Siddhanta,* 444 pages. In this source-book on Indian mystics he made the reader see the sharp Tamilian intellect and what this was able to produce. Schomerus later on translated into German *The Hymns of Manikka Vasagar,* 215 pages, and also the *Periya Puranam,* 306 pages. This book also contains a translation of the *Tiruvatavurarpuranam.* He also is the translator of the songs of Karaikkal Ammaiyar and the Andal-Alvar.[25] When he died he left about 1,000 pages of manuscripts and translations, the titles of which I have mentioned elsewhere.[26]

For the time being the last in this line is the present writer who spent more than seven years in South India. *The Hymns of Tayumanavar* were for the first time translated into German,[27] and at the same time this translation is the first really complete one, without any omission, in an European language.

This " prince of Tamil mystics "[28] certainly deserves to be widely known ! In another translation I went down to the time about 800 A.D. Translated were hymns sung by Tirujnanasambandamurti Nayanar, Tirunavukkarasu Nayanar and Sundaramurti Nayanar. The hymns of these famous

---

25 H. W. SCHOMERUS : *Indien und das Christentum I.* Halle, 1931, pp. 177-198.

26 A list is found in ARNO LEHMANN : *Die sivaitische Frommiakeit der tamulischen Erbauungslitreatur,* Berlin, 1948, p. 27.

27 ARNO LEHMAN : *Die Hymnen des Tayumanavar, Texte zur Gottesmystik des Hinduïsmus.* Gütersloh 1935, pp. 270.

28 ARNO LEHMANN : *Die sivaitische Frömmigkeit der tamulischen Erbauungsliteratur,* Berlin, 1948.

singers help greatly to understand and to value the bhakti religion.

Within the vast field of Indology, the studies in and translations of Tamil literature are but a small section. Yet they belong to the whole of indology which no longer can be considered to be the field of Sanscrit-literature alone. Tamil literature helps to serve as a key towards the understanding of Indian philosophy and religion, Indian mystics and Indian ethics. It therefore should be the concern of indologists and theologians, philosophers and students of linguistics to pay greater attention to Tamil studies.

/.

Tolkappiyar and the Science of Phonemics

C. R. SANKARAN

DEDICATED TO THE LATE PROFESSOR W. MEYER-EPPLER *

ABSTRACT

The importance of a detailed study of Tolkappiyam was stressed in my monograph. A detailed study of some of the Sutras is undertaken now.

Interpolations are found in ancient classics—lines 2, 3, and 4, of the first Sūtra of Pirappiyal are proved to be interpolations.

'Unti' is defined as the diaphragm and the first Sūtra is critically examined. The substance of this Sūtra is briefly this: This upward breath pushed out by the diaphragmatic action enters the vocal organs, attains formation and then falls into a regularity. The Sūtra further says that when the speech sequence is analysed into phonemes of which it is composed and the component elements of the phonemes are examined, the formative compositions which bring these phonemes into existence are varied and different in their characteristics.

INTRODUCTION

In my monograph, 'Phonemics of Old Tamil'[1] I stressed the importance of a critical study of *Tolkappiyam*. It is necessary to recall those very words I used then. I

* Professor W. Meyer-Eppler was a great scientist friend of the author of this paper. He took great interest in the Aytam phenomenon of Tolkappiyar and the alpha-phonoid theory of the author. He, it was who moved the German academy for research and the Bonn University to invite the author of this paper as a visiting professor at Bonn in 1960. The author C. R. Sankaran cannot adequately express in words how much he owes to the late Professor W. Meyer-Eppler for the many generous encouragements he had received from him in the scientific work. He was greatly interested in placing the study of phonemics on a mathematical basis and did much to popularise this in Germany. He died at the age of 47 on Friday the 8th of July 1960 when the author was at Bonn.

1 *Phonemics of Old Tamil*, Deccan College Monograph Series 7, Poona, 1951.

wrote, " We are lost in wonder that in this old Tamil grammar, we re-discover, as it were, many of our own modern ideas. The conviction is gained more and more that it is worth the while to subject *Tolkappiyam* to a detailed scrutiny exploiting this beautiful work from the rigorous viewpoint of modern Phonemics."[2] It will be obvious from these words that my monograph was not prepared after a critical or detailed study of this great work — which may well nigh take the life-time of a competent scholar — but only after a surface-study, as it were, by rough and ready method. I have sufficiently indicated in my monograph that I followed mostly the English translations of Dr. P. S. S. Sastri only on the bare surface. Divergencies from his translations for obvious scientific reasons were also indicated by me suitably.[3]

I was so overwhelmed with the rich harvest which even this rough and ready method yielded, and the phonemic truths found even on the surface of this exquisite work were so astounding, I thought it my duty to proclaim them to the modern world without waiting for critical or detailed study. After the publication of my monograph, I rather concentrated myself in investigating, developing and explaining my alpha-phonoid theory based on the Aytam-phenomenon which I picked up from *Tolkappiyam*, straying of course, now and then, into allied fields for a while.

It was a lucky accident that I read one of the valuable articles of Rao Sahib K. K. Pillai in the TAMIL CULTURE, as my attention to it was drawn by one of my friends. Subsequently I got into correspondence with him which dragged me again to the study of *Tolkappiyam*. His correspondence was so thought-provoking and illuminating that it goaded me to dive deep into at least some of the basic sūtras relating to phonemic structure found in

---

2 Page 58 of Ref. No. 1.

3 *cf.* Foot note 21 on page 13 of Ref. No. 1.

'Pirappiyal', the chapter on the birth of the phonemes, as it is usually translated and some of the results of this study are set forth in the present paper.

Interpolations

To rejoice in the glory of the past has always been a human trait all through the ages. Exploiting this universal interest in the past glory, the malignant busybody has been at work all over the world to create glory where it did not exist and to white-wash the black spots wherever they existed, resorting to interpolations, forgeries and other questionable methods. It is the considered opinion of the research scholars that no ancient classic is free from this evil. It is therefore necessary for anyone who takes up a critical study of any ancient work to spot out first the interpolations, if any, and to eschew them. Interpolations often introduce new thoughts which do not generally fit into the particular pattern of the thought of the author and the consequent lapses, therefore, of the interpolator cannot withstand the scrutiny of a critical investigator. It may be taken as a general principle, that whatever is repugnant or contrary to the main text of any ancient work should decidedly be an interpolation. With these broad principles in view, the chapter on the birth of phonemes (chapter III) will be examined.

The chapter opens with the following sūtra :—

Unti mutalā muntuvali tōn̲r̲it
Talaiyin̲u mitatr̲inu nencin̲u nilaiip
Pallu mitalu nāvu mūkku
Maṇṇamu mulappaṭa veṇmur̲ai nilaiyā
Nur̲uppur̲ r̲amaiya ner̲ippaṭa nāṭi
Yellā veḷuttun collun kālaip
Pir̲appi n̲ākkam vēr̲uvē r̲iyala
Tir̲appaṭat teriyuṅ kāṭchi yān̲a.

உந்தி முதலா முந்துவளி தோன்றித்
தலையினு மிடற்றினு நெஞ்சினு நிலைஇப்
பல்லு மிதழு நாவு மூக்கும்
அண்ணமு முளப்பட வெண்முறை நிலையான்
உறுப்புற் றமைய நெறிப்பட நாடி
எல்லா வெழுத்துஞ் சொல்லுங் காலைப்
பிறப்பி னுக்கம் வேறுவே றியல
திறப்படத் தெரியுங் காட்சி யான.

This forms the introduction to the subject of phonemic structure dealt with in this chapter and facilitates the correct understanding of its scientific basis. Though laconic in style, the brief and pithy words reveal the analytic study which the author made of the speech sequence to arrive at the phonemic units and the principles of phonemic structure.

Lines 2 to 4 are interpolations

A critical study of this sūtra reveals that its lines 2, 3 and 4 are interpolations. They mar the general trend of the sūtra and its aphoristic nature. They do not fit into the pattern of thought embodied in the rest of the lines. The thought embodied in line 1, runs without hindrance into line 5, in orderly sequence as தோன்றி, உற்று, அமைய, நெறிப்பட, etc. and does not need the intervening lines for its continuity. The insertion of the lines 2 to 4 in between them disrupts the thought structure, inverts the sequence of the thought as well as the grammatical construction.

The second line asserts that the breath stays or halts (நிலைஇ) in the head etc. and the fourth line continues this ill-conceived idea and includes head as one of the positions which produce phonemes! Tolkappiyar nowhere mentions, either in this chapter or elsewhere, head, as one of the vocal organs, which gives rise to phonemes. In the stream of speech there is no room for the breath to enter the head or sojourn there. It is not only erroneous but

even ridiculously preposterous to state that the breath halts in the head to produce a phoneme at all!

The lines 2, 3 and 4 thus offend the physiological truth obviously being contrary to it and are therefore manifestly repugnant to the rest of the chapter and to *Tolkappiyam* as a whole. They have therefore to be expelled as flagrant interpolations, which clearly they are without doubt! Evidently some misguided enthusiast introduced these lines to rectify a supposed defect in order to place the phonemes of *Tolkappiyam* on a par with Sanskrit phonemes of so called murdhanya variety.

Derivation and Definition of Unti

This sūtra offers yet another impediment to the correct understanding of its meaning. The very first word in the first line Unti உந்தி has to be critically examined for its correct meaning.

This unti has been interpreted by all the commentators to mean the nābhi of the Sanskrit, i.e. the navel. No doubt a few Sangam poets and later writers have also used this word in this sense but the word carries in itself its own meaning which is far different from what it has been taken to mean all along quite apparently. உந்தி is derived from the word உந்து which means to push out or thrust away. உந்தி therefore means that which pushes or thrusts away (உந்துவது உந்தி). The difficulty encountered by the commentators who came more than a thousand years after the author had not been so much in finding the meaning of the word as it was obviously in identifying the human organ which performs the biological function denoted by the word, putting themselves on a false search, as it were!

The navel or the umbilical chord, which this word has been taken to mean wrongly, is really called கொப்பூழ்

Koppūl in Tamil which is the shortened form of கோப்பூழ் (கோப்பு+ஊழ்=கோப்பூழ்). கோப்பு means that which connects and ஊழ் means that which comes off in natural course. The meaning of கோப்பு is obvious and that of ஊழ் requires elucidation. ஊழ்த்த or ஊழ்ப்ப in the sense of coming off or falling away is often used in Sangam literature. பழம் ஊழ்த்து (புறம். 381), மென்கொம் பூழ்த்த மணிமருள் பூவின் பாடு (குறுந்தொகை, 138), and கொங்கம் பொன்னென தாதூழ்ப்ப (கலி. 33) are some of the instances of such an usage. ஊழ் Ūl denotes fate as that which comes off in natural order as a sequence of one's own past actions. கோப்பூழ் thus denotes that which connects with the mother's womb or the placenta therein and comes off in natural course at the time of parturition. No better physiological term than this can be thought of to express the navel. The words umbilical chord or navel and even nābhi meet it half way only as they superficially refer to the central position in the body. No other word to supplant this tell-tale scientific term in Tamil seems to be found. The function of this கொப்பூழ் is to draw and absorb nutrition from the mother and its function is obviously not to push out or thrust away anything! Is the genius of Tamil language reflected here which brings into awareness what otherwise would have remained as an unconscious "yearning to be re-united with childhood with the shelter and protection of motherly aid" carried to the womb itself in the pre-natal period? (cf. Joist A. M. Merrloo — *The Two faces of Man—Two studies on the sense of time and of ambivalence*, International Universities Press, Inc., New York, 1954, p. 68.)

The human organ which in reality has the function of pushing out or thrusting away (உந்துதல்) is the diaphragm. It thrusts away the lung which sits on it and thus causes the breath to get out and causes the phenomenon or speech. If we are to be guided by the scientific content of the word உந்தி, the organ denoted by it is unmistakably the diaphragm and nothing but the diaphragm.

I am fortified in this derivation and identification by the definition given by Swami Vipulananda (late professor and head of the department of Tamil, Ceylon University, Colombo) for one of the parts of the ancient Tamil harp, Yāl (யாழ்), which was also called Unti whose function, according to him, was to push away the sound which reached it and thus cause reverberation. I give below his very words:

> "உந்தி என்னும் சொல் உந்து என்னும் வினையடியாகப் பிறந்ததென்பது 'சென்று வாங்கு உந்தி' என்பதனால் தெளிவாகின்றது. உந்தி என்னும் பெயர் கொப்பூழுக்கு உளதாதல் பற்றிக் கொப்பூழ் போன்ற வட்டவடிவமாகிய யாழ் பத்தற் றுளையினை உணர்த்திற்று எனக்கொண்ட மயிலை நாதருரை பொருந்தா உரையாதல் காண்கின்றோம்."

(p. 45. *Yāl Nūl* (Tamil) published by Karanthai Tamil Sangam.) May we not pause a while here, in asking ourselves incidentally as it were, whether it is merely a strange coincidence that a musical term extends its helping hand to rescue from oblivion what in reality is obviously a precious term in phonemic science? (I am indebted to Rao Sahib Pillai for drawing my attention to this reference and furnishing the extract.)

Tolkappiyar thus undoubtedly leads the way to modern biolinguistics and biophysical studies of human speech.

> "The primary physical impulse comes from the diaphragm or midriff, that dome shaped sheet of fibrous tissue which is the muscle of respiration. This tendinous partition separating thorax from abdomen turns its concave side downwards and it is fastened to the sternum or breast bone in front, to the lumbar vertibrae behind and to the cartilages of the lower six ribs on either side . . . As the outgoing breath stream is forced by diaphragmatic pressure upwards (உந்தி முதலா முந்துவளி தோன்றி as *Tolkappiyam* puts it) from the lungs through the bronchial

> tubes and the trachea or wind pipe into the mouth it may be checked or impeded in various ways,"[4]

so as to give us the speech sounds. This formed the subject of one of my Bonn University lectures concerned with process of speech. It is the exploitation of this breath movement by human ingenuity which has given us the spoken language and which has revolutionised the human kingdom and made it what it is today!

THE SPEECH STRUCTURE

The upward breath (முந்துவளி) makes its appearance (தோன்றி) in the sphere of speech sequence, reaches the vocal organs (உறுப்புற்று) and attains formation (அமைய). The word அமைய is from the root அமை which means to form or make. All the other meanings assigned to this word are only its derivative meanings.

The organs reached are not mentioned here nor are the formations attained given. The interpolated lines describe these organs in detail, though wrongly, but leave off the formations. If the author mentioned the details of these organs he would have doubtless described the details of the formations too! This is not the place to furnish the details of any of them. This is only an introductory sūtra where these will be redundant and out of place. Tolkappiyar had recognised this. It is for the sūtras which follow — the text proper — to take up the thread and give the necessary details. This is how the interpolated lines do not fit into the pattern of the thought and plan of the author and betray their intrusion.

The structural formations observed are not haphazard events appearing in any manner but follow an orderly sequence. They fall into a regularity (நெறிப்பட) as stated by the author. What a deep insight Tolkappiyar has dis-

---

[4] *Simeon Potter's Modern Linguistics*, Andre Deutsch, 1957, pp. 14-15.

played! and how scientific have been his observations!! It is this fundamental law of regularity into which these formations fall which has made them amenable to scientific or mathematical treatment. It has been my life's ambition to take up these at the stage where Tolkappiyar left them and reduce them to mathematical formulae for the modern world. I have been attempting, in my humble way, to do this in all my work, including my lectures now at Bonn.

The knitting together of these short, telling words, தோன்றி, உற்று, அமைய, நெறிப்பட, in rapid succession, raises itself a mental picture of the rapid stream of speech-sequence! One who follows the author closely cannot but feel the effect of the artistic rapidity and the logical sequence!

The author studies this speech structure. He studies its processes நாடி with an ardour and earnestness. The word நாடி means விரும்பி ஆராய்ந்து and denotes a research with ardour and earnestness which are the prime requisites for any scientific investigation (நாடிய பொருள் கை கூடும்-கம்பன்; எழுத்தும் சொல்லும் பொருளும் நாடி, பனம்பாரனர்-தொல். பாயிரம்). These basic factors of research, ardour and earnestness have taken the author to the depths of the intricate processes, and made his findings amazingly modern.

Analysis of the Speech Sequence

Now follows the next stage, எல்லா எழுத்தும் சொல்லும் காலை. All the phonemes are to be found, enumerated and described. The speech sequence has to be broken into the various sound-units of which it is composed and forms a synthetic structure. The primary speech-units which are obtained on analysing the speech-sequence are called phonemes in modern language. Phoneme is called எழுத்து Eluttu, in Tamil (from the root எழு to rise) which means that which arises or forms from the breath.

This analysis is by no means easy. Only those who have been actually at it can realise the difficulties involved. In the speech-stream some of the speech-units may get drowned, some may become merged with one another, some may get dissolved, lose their identity and appear durationless. The functional activities of the vocal organs may overlap. All these have to be observed minutely and then only all the phonemes which go to make up the speech-structure have to be fixed with precision, their number enumerated and arrived at correctly. The term சொல்லுங் காலை means and includes not only the number of these phonemes to be told off, எல்லா எழுத்தும், but their descriptions as well. Only the study of the compositions which go to make up each of the phonemes can help to identify, each from the other, as separate units and to count them out as all the phonemes, எல்லா எழுத்தும், that constitute the speech-structure.

A clear and unerring perception of all these is therefore necessary. This perception has therefore to be திறப் படத் தெரியும் காட்சி - காட்சி means perception. திறப்படத் தெரியும் காட்சி therefore means a perception in which all the minute parts of the intricate structure will get analysed (திறப்பட) and will be seen clearly (தெரியும்). Nothing but a sure perception as this, will yield observational knowledge to form the basis of any science. Such a perception as this is vital especially when the subject dealt with is '*Sound*' which is not easily amenable to analysis as other material objects are! Tolkappiyar obtained this rare and vital perception which is the *sine qua non* of phonemic science and by that perception, திறப்படத் தெரியும் காட்சியான், he proceeds to describe the phonemes.

It is to emphasise the importance of this perception the clause which deals with it— திறப்படத் தெரியும் காட்சியான் —has been so purposefully fixed at the end of the sūtra to leave a lasting impression upon the mind of the reader while studying the sūtra, untrammelled by the

other thoughts which precede. Taking the important thought in a stanza to the end has been the *modus operandi* in ancient classics and has been the practice of the great poets of the Sangam age. It may also be noted that by the position which this clause occupies, it governs grammatically both the analysis of speech-structure எல்லா எழுத்தும் சொல்லுங் காலே and பிறப்பின் ஆக்கம் the composition of speech-unit which follows it.

PHONEMIC STRUCTURE

The word திறம் means here கூறுபாடு i.e., the component elements or the constituent parts. (நிற்றிறம் சிறக்க. புறம். 6). Each of the phonemes has its own component parts and these component elements may broadly be divided as acoustic and articulatory. The famous French scientist De Saussure aptly describes this :

> "The delimitation of the sounds of a speech sequence can be based only on the acoustical impression; but, as far as the description of sounds is concerned, it is different. It is recognised to be built only on the basis of the articulatory act; because the acoustic units taken in their proper succession are unanalysable. One must take recourse to the succession of the movements of phonation; it is then observed that to the same sound corresponds the same act: b (acoustic time) = b′ (articulatory time).
>
> "The primary units which are obtained on dividing the speech sequence will be composed of b and b′; they are called *Phonemes*; the phoneme is the sum of the acoustic impressions and the articulatory movements, the heard unit and the spoken unit, the one conditioning the other: thus it is already a complex unit, having a hold in each speech sequence." [5]

[5] *Rulon S. Wells, De Saussure's System of Linguistics*, Word, Vol. 3, 1947, p. 2. Translation of the portion quoted was made by Dr. P. C. Ganesh Sundaram, Reader in Experimental Phonetics, Annamalai University (Cf. *Phonemics of Old Tamil*, p. 37 foot note 100).

The acoustical impression is that by which we judge the form of the sound-units, their individual existence each separate from the other, in time and space and the articulatory movement includes the movement of the breath, the physical impulse, the muscular actions of the breath-group and the functional status of the vocal organs to bring the sound-units into existence. Each phoneme is thus composed of articulatory element and acoustic element, one conditioning the other as De Saussure puts it. It will be seen from the text which follows that Tolkappiyar classifies the acoustic forms of the sound as well as the corresponding articulatory movements of the vocal organs, combining into various groups into which they naturally fall. Tolkappiyar by an analytical perception திறப்படத் தெரியும் காட்சியான் not only fixes the number of phonemes which are found in the speech-structure correctly but also finds that their பிறப்பின் ஆக்கம், their formative compositions — acoustic and articulatory — are of varied and different characteristics, வேறு வேறு இயல. The sūtras which follow illustrate and demonstrate them.

In its pristine simplicity, the sūtra flows, தோன்றி, உற்று, அமைய, நெறிப்பட (இவற்றை) நாடி, திறப்படத் தெரியும் காட்சியான், எல்லா எழுத்தும் சொல்லும் காலை (அவைதம்) பிறப் பின் ஆக்கம் வேறு வேறு இயல and carries with it its own grandeur. The apparent transparency deludes the eye, conceals the depth and often frustrates the search! A more appropriate introduction embracing all the aspects of the subject dealt with in the chapter cannot be thought of, it is obvious.

It is here worth while to take note of the luminous phrase which Tolkappiyar has coined as பிறப்பின் ஆக்கம். The word பிறப்பு means coming into existence and ஆக்கம் means growth, composition or development. (cf. களவி யாக்கம், பொருளாக்கம்). There are thus two elements in this term, ஆக்கம் and பிறப்பு. The composition of articulatory-unit and acoustic-unit into one is ஆக்கம் and

this composition bringing into existence a new entity, the phoneme, is பிறப்பு.

That Tolkappiyar used பிறப்பின் ஆக்கம் exactly to mean these will be proved by the fact that he calls the formation or composition of words, their growth and multiplication as கிளவியாக்கம் (It should be noted that no பிறப்பு is added in that context.) The various factors which go to make up the word-formations, their growth and multiplication are merely stringed together to a stem as in a bead, as it were, where each is piled quite close to the other to form a developed structure. No new entity is born here. This formative process is far different in the case of a phoneme. Two different units, the acoustic unit and the articulatory unit, combine into one to give birth to a new entity the phoneme or எழுத்து. This is therefore described as பிறப்பின் ஆக்கம் and not as எழுத்தின் ஆக்கம் —as in the case of கிளவியாக்கம் —not even as எழுத்தின் பிறப்பு but distinctly as பிறப்பின் ஆக்கம் **i.e.,** பிறப்பு and ஆக்கம் combined.

The grammarians and commentators who succeeded Tolkappiyar converted this highly scientific term பிறப்பின் ஆக்கம் into பிறப்பிடம் the place of birth ! I have shown in my monograph how places of birth and even places of articulation are scientifically inaccurate and Tolkappiyar nowhere uses such an inaccurate term.[6]

G. Oscar Russel, the great pioneer, by bringing X-Ray to the service of phonetic science, fixed with accuracy and demonstrated the forms and sizes of human speech cavities as also the position and relative relationship of the various physiological organs which actually appear when producing certain speaking resultants; the connected movements of muscles regulating the vocal cavity are not and never can be still for an instant.[7]

---

6 Page 13 of Ref. No. 1.

7 *Speech and Voice* by G. OSCAR RUSSEL, New York, Macmillan & Co., 1931 p. 4.

cf., also *Phonemics of Old Tamil*, page 13, foot notes 23 and 24.

The demonstration of the fallacy of the "places of articulation" relied upon by the earlier phoneticians now confirms the valid usage of the 'analytic-synthetic' term of Tolkappiyar பிறப்பின் ஆக்கம் being scientifically precise.

It is marvellous that this ancient tiny phrase, பிறப்பின் ஆக்கம் is thus replete with the results of modern scientific investigations. It thrills one to think of the wealth of analytic perception, the depth of scientific knowledge and the 'logical positivism' which have gone into the core of this puny phrase, as it were. How this author, in those ancient times, without resorting to modern precision apparatus and rigorous mathematics, was still able to perceive the vital truths of an abstruse and intricate science, it staggers the human brain to conceive of.

சிலப்பதிகாரம் குடி மக்கள் காப்பியமா?

வை. கா. சிவப்பிரகாசம்

இறவாத புகழ்படைத்த இன்பத்தமிழ் இலக்கியங்கள் பல. அவற்றுள் ஒன்று சேரன் தம்பியார் இளங்கோ இசைத்த சிலப்பதிகாரம். நவில்தொறும் நூல் நயம் நல்கும் சிலப்பதிகாரம் தலையாய செந்தமிழ்க் காப்பியமாகப் போற்றப்படும் பெருமை பெற்றுள்ளது. பன்னூறு ஆண்டுகளாகக் கன்னற்சுவைக் களஞ்சியமாய்த் திகழ்ந்து வரும் சிலப்பதிகாரத்தைப் பாரதியார் முப்பேரிலக்கியங்களுள் ஒன்றாகப் போற்றி மதிப்பிடுகிறார்; அவ்வாறே இளங்கோ அடிகளையும் முப்பேரிலக்கிய ஆசிரியர்களுள் ஒருவராகக் கருதுகிறார்.

"வள்ளுவன் தன்னை உலகினுக் கேதந்து
வான்புகழ் கொண்ட தமிழ்நாடு—நெஞ்சை
அள்ளும் சிலப்பதி காரமென் றோர்மணி
யாரம் படைத்த தமிழ்நாடு."

எனவும்,

"யாமறிந்த புலவரிலே கம்பனைப்போல்
வள்ளுவர்போல் இளங்கோ வைப்போல்
பூமிதனில் யாங்கணுமே பிறந்ததில்லை;
உண்மை;வெறும் புகழ்ச்சி யில்லை."

எனவும் பாரதியார் கூறியவை என்றும் தமிழர் சிந்தையை விட்டகலா. சிலப்பதிகாரம் எவ்வகை இலக்கியம் என்பது பற்றிப் பல்வேறு கருத்துக்கள் தமிழகத்தில் நிலவி வருகின்றன. தொல்காப்பிய நெறி, வடமொழி நெறி, ஐரோப்பிய நெறி மூன்றற்கு இயையவும் சிலப்பதிகாரம் ஆராயப்பட்டுள்ளது. தொல்காப்பியத்தை நுண்ணிதின் ஆய்ந்த உரையாசிரியர் நச்சினார்க்கினியர், சிலப்பதிகாரம் 'தொன்மை' என்னும் வகையைச் சார்ந்தது என்கிறார். (தொல். பொருள். செய். உரை) சிலப்பதிகாரத்தின் உரைப்பாயிரம், 'இயலிசை நாடகப் பொருட்டொடர்நிலைச் செய்யுள்,' எனவும், 'நாடகக் காப்பியம்' எனவும், 'தோல்' எனவும் அதனைக் குறிப்பிடுகிறது; நூலின் பதிகம் 'உரையிடையிட்ட பாட்டுடைச் செய்யுள்' என்று உரைக்கிறது. காப்பிய இலக்கண அமைதிக்கேற்பச் சிலப்பதிகாரம் பெருங்காப்பியமென்பர். ஐம்பெருங்காப்பியங்களுள்

ஒன்ருகவும் சிலப்பதிகாரம் போற்றப்படுகிறது. பெருங்காப்பிய இலக்கண அமைதி சிலப்பதிகாரத்தில் இல்லை என்று கருதுவாரு முளர். மேனுட்டு இலக்கிய ஆராய்ச்சியில் ஈடுபாடுடைய அறிஞர் சிலர், புதிய கோணத்திலிருந்து சிலப்பதிகாரத்தை ஆராய்ந்துள்ள னர். வரலாற்றுக் காப்பியமெனவும், ஒற்றுமைக் காப்பியமென வும், கலைக் காப்பியமெனவும், குடிமக்கள் காப்பியமெனவும் இன்று சிலப்பதிகாரம் சிறப்பிக்கப்படுகின்றது. இவ்வாறு சிலப்பதிகாரம் பலவாறு ஆராயப்பட்டுள்ளது. இவற்றுள் சிலப்பதிகாரம் குடிமக்கள் காப்பியம் என்னும் கொள்கையை ஆராய்வாம் :

தமிழிற்ருேன்றிய முதற்காப்பியம் சிலப்பதிகாரம். மற்றைய பல தமிழ்க் காப்பியங்கள் போலச் சிலப்பதிகாரம் முடி மக்கள் காப்பியமாய் அமையவில்லை. சிலப்பதிகாரத்தில் சேரன் செங்குட்டு வன் சொல்லோவியமாகக் காட்சியளிக்கின்ருன்; சோழன் கரிகாலன் (?) தோன்றுகிருன்; பாண்டியன் நெடுஞ்செழியன் பவனி வருகிருன். எனினும், அவர்கள் கதைத்தலைவர்கள் அல்லர். எனவே, சிலப்பதிகாரம் முடி மக்கள் காப்பியம் அன்று.

சிலப்பதிகாரத்தின் கதைத் தலைவன் கோவலன்; கதைத்தலைவி கண்ணகி. அவர்கள் அரச குலத்தினர் அல்லர். அவ்வாறே மற் ெருரு சிறந்த பாத்திரமான மாதவியும் அரச குலத்தினள் அல்லள். இவர்கள் மன்னனுல் ஆளப்படும் குடிகள்—மக்கள்–குடி மக்கள். அதனுல், சிலப்பதிகாரம் குடிமக்கள் காப்பியம் என்ெருரு கொள்கை நிலவி வருகிறது.

சிலப்பதிகாரம் குடி மக்கள் காப்பியம் என்ற கொள்கையைப் போற்றுவோர் பிறிதொரு சிக்கலையும் இதனேடு பிணைத்து ஆராய்ந் துள்ளனர். 'முதலாளி இலக்கியமும் முடி மக்கள் இலக்கியமு மன்றிக் குடி மக்கள் இலக்கியமென யாதாயினும் தமிழிலுண்டா ?' என்ற விஞவையும் ஆராய்ந்துள்ளனர். வேட்டுவவரி, வேடர்களின் வாழ்க்கை, போராட்டம், வழிபாடு ஆகியவற்றை விளக்குகிறது. ஆய்ச்சியர குரவை, இடையர்களின் வாழ்வு, இன்பதுன்பம் முதலிய வற்றை உரைக்கிறது. குன்றக்குரவை, குறவர் வாழ்வு, வளன், எண்ணம் என்பவற்றைக் கூறுகிறது. இவ்வாறு பாட்டாளிகளை இளங்கோவடிகள் போற்றிப்பாடுதலால் சிலப்பதிகாரம் குடி மக்கள் காப்பியம் என்ற கொள்கை வலியுறுத்தப்படுகிறது. அதன் பயனுக ஈண்டுக் குறித்த சிக்கலும் விடுவிக்கப்படுகிறது.

முதலாளி தொழிலாளி என்ற பாகுபாட்டுணர்ச்சி இருபதாம் நூற்ருண்டின் தொடக்கத்தில் இரஷ்யநாட்டில் வெடித்த புரட்சியின்

பின்னரே உலகிற்பரவியது. பணம் படைத்தோர் உழைப்பாள ரைச் சுரண்டி உறிஞ்சி இன்ப வாழ்வு நடத்தும் இழிதகவுக்கு இரஷ்யப் புரட்சி சாவுமணி அடித்தது. இப்புரட்சியின் விளைவாக இலக்கியத்தையும் இக்கண்ணேட்டத்துடன் ஆராயும் போக்கு இலக் கியத்திறனுய்வாளர்பால் செல்வாக்குப் பெற்றது. அதனுல், இலக்கி யத்தை முடி மக்கள் இலக்கியம் அல்லது முடியரசு இலக்கியம், மேன்மக்கள் இலக்கியம் அல்லது முதலாளி இலக்கியம், குடி மக்கள் இலக்கியம் அல்லது பாட்டாளி இலக்கியம் என்று பாகுபாடு செய்து ஆயும் ஆராய்ச்சி புரட்சிப் போக்குப் படைத்த இலக்கியத் திறனுய்வாளர்பால் குடிகொண்டது. வேந்தர்களின் வாழ்க்கை, போராட்டம், வெற்றி மேம்பாடு என்று இனையவற்றை விளம்பும் இலக்கியம் முடி மக்கள் இலக்கியம் அல்லது முடியரசு இலக்கியம் எனப்படும்.

மேல்மக்கள், பிரபுக்கள், முதலாளிகள் என்போர் வாழ்க்கை, இன்பதுன்பங்கள், புகழ் போன்றவற்றை விளக்கும் இலக்கியம் மேன்மக்கள் இலக்கியம் அல்லது முதலாளி இலக்கியம் எனப் படும். செல்வர்களின் சுரண்டல், இரக்கமற்ற கொடுமை, ஏமாற்று வித்தை, பிறன் உழைப்பில் வாழ்தல் என்பன முதலாளி இலக்கி யத்தின் உயிர் நாடியான அமிசங்களாகும்.

பாடு பட்டு உழைக்கும் பாட்டாளிகள், சமுதாயத்தில் சுரண் டப்பட்டோர், வஞ்சிக்கப்பட்ட வறியோர் என்போர் வாழ்க்கை, துன்பம், போராட்டம் முதலியவற்றைப் படம் பிடிக்கும் இலக்கியம் குடி மக்கள் இலக்கியம் அல்லது பாட்டாளி இலக்கியமெனப்படும். உழைப்பின் பெருமை, முதலாளியை முறியடிக்கும் போராட்டம், தொழில் மேம்பாடு, சமுதாய முன்னேற்றம் என்பன பாட்டாளி இலக்கியத்தில் இன்றியமையாத அமிசங்களாகும்.

இலக்கியம் காலத்தால் படைக்கப்படுவது; இடத்தால் வளம் பெறுவது; மனித சிந்தையால் மாண்புறுவது; சமுதாயத்தால் செழித்தோங்குவது. முடியரசுக் காலத்தில் முடியரசு இலக்கியம் யாக்கப்படும். கோனுட்சி போற்றப்படும் நாட்டில் தோன்றும் இலக்கியம் முடியரசுக் கொள்கையை ஓம்பும். முடியாட்சிக் கொள் கையில் மூழ்கிய மனித சிந்தனையிலிருந்து முடிமக்கள் இலக்கியம் முகிழ்த்து மாண்புபெறும். சமுதாயத்தில் முடியாட்சிக் கொள்கை வேரூன்றி இருப்பின், முடி மக்கள் இலக்கியம் செழித்தோங்கும். இது பொது விதி. குடியரசுக் காலத்திற்கும் இவ்வுண்மை பொருந் தும். முடியரசுக் காலத்தில் குடி மக்கள் இலக்கியமும் குடியரசுக்

5

காலத்தில் முடி மக்கள் இலக்கியமும் தோன்றிச் சிறக்கும் என எதிர்பார்த்தல் ஆகாது. ஆனால், இப்பொதுமை நெறிக்கு மாறாக வும் இலக்கியம் எழலாம்.

சிலப்பதிகாரம் முடியரசுக் காலத்தில் முகிழ்த்தது; முடியாட்சி நிலை பெற்றிருந்த தமிழகத்தில் தழைத்தது; முடியாட்சிக் கொள் கையில் மூழ்கிய இளங்கோ அடிகளின் சிந்தனைச் சிறப்பால் மலர்ந்தது; முடியாட்சியில் திளைத்த தமிழ்ச் சமுதாயத்தில் பூத்துக் கனிந்தது. வேழம் மலிந்த சேரநாட்டை வஞ்சியிலிருந்து செங் குட்டுவன் செங்கோலோச்சினான். கலை வளம் படைத்த சோழ நாட்டைக் கரிகால் வளவன் புகாரிலிருந்து பாதுகாத்தான். தமிழ் நிலை பெற்ற பாண்டி நாட்டைப் பாண்டியன் நெடுஞ்செழியன் மதுரையிலிருந்து ஆண்டான்.

எனவே, முடியரசுக் காலத்தில் முடியாட்சித் தமிழகத்தில் முடி சூடா மன்னர் இளங்கோவால் இயற்றப்பட்ட முத்தமிழ்க் காப்பியம் சிலப்பதிகாரம் ஆகும்.

சிலப்பதிகாரத் தமிழகத்தில் முடியாட்சி சிறந்து விளங்கின தாயினும், அம்முடியாட்சி உலகில் ஏனைய பாகங்களில் நிலவிய முடியாட்சியின் வேறுபட்டது. குடி நலன் ஓம்பல், மக்கள் எண் ணத்திற்கு மதிப்புக் கொடுத்தல், அன்பரசு செலுத்தல், அறம் வளர்த்தல் என்றினைய விழுமிய கொள்கைகள் தமிழ் முடியரசின் அடித்தளமாய் அமைந்தன.

> "கோள்வல் உளியமும் கொடும்புற் றகழா;
> வாள்வரி வேங்கையும் மான்கணம் மறலா;
> அரவுஞ் சூரும் இரைதேர் முதலையும்
> உருமுஞ் சார்ந்தவர்க் குறுகண் செய்யா;
> செங்கோல் தென்னவர் காக்கும் நாடென
> எங்கணும் போகிய இசையோ பெரிதே!"
>
> (புறஞ்சேரி இறுத்தகாதை : 5-10)

எனவும்,

> "குடிபுர வுண்டுங் கொடுங்கோ லஞ்சி
> மன்பதை காக்கும் நன்குடிப் பிறத்தல்
> துன்ப மல்லது தொழுதக வில்." (காட்சிக் காதை : 102-104)

எனவும்,

" செம்மையின் இகந்தசொற் செவிப்புலம் படாமுன்
உயிர்பதிப் பெயர்ந்தமை உறுக ஈங்கென "
(காட்சிக் காதை : 96-97)

எனவும்,

" அடிதொழு திறைஞ்சா மன்ன ரல்லது
குடிபழி தூற்றும் கோலனும் அல்லன் "
(கட்டுரை காதை : 33-34)

எனவும் இவ்வாறு வரும் பகுதிகள் தமிழ் முடியரசின் தன்மையைப் புலப்படுத்துகின்றன.

முடியரசுத் தமிழகத்தில் சிலப்பதிகாரம் இயற்றப்பட்டதாயினும், முடி மக்கள் காப்பியமாக அது விளங்கவில்லை. காலம், இடம், சமுதாயம் இவற்றின் போக்கிற்கு ஒருவாறு மாறுபட்டதாகவே சிலப்பதிகாரம் அமைந்துள்ளது. இது செந்தமிழ்க் கவிஞர் இளங்கோ செய்த புரட்சி.

சிலப்பதிகாரத்தின் கதைத் தலைவன் கோவலன்; கதைத் தலைவி கண்ணகி. இருவரும் வணிக குலத்தினர். இவர்கள் மன்னனுட்சிக்கு உட்பட்ட மக்கள் என்ற முறையில் சிலப்பதிகாரம் குடி மக்கள் காப்பியம் என்ற கொள்கையை ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளலாம். முதலாளி வர்க்கத்தினராக இவர்கள் விளங்கலாம் ; பாட்டாளி இலக்கியம் என்ற பொருளில் சிலப்பதிகாரம் குடி மக்கள் இலக்கியம் என்னும் கொள்கையை ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளலாமா என்பது ஆராய்தற்பாலது.

சிலப்பதிகாரம் குடி மக்கள் காப்பியம் என்னும் கொள்கையினர் ஆளப்படுவோர் தொழிலாளர் என்ற இரு பொருளிலும் 'குடி மக்கள்' என்னும் தொடரை வழங்குவர். 'தொழிலாளர்' என்னும் பொருள் இக்கால வழக்கு. சிலப்பதிகாரத்தில் குடிகள், தொழிலாளர் என்ற சொல்லாட்சி இருப்பினும் தொழிலாளர் அல்லது பாட்டாளிகள் என்ற பொருளில் 'குடிகள், குடி மக்கள்' என்னும் சொற்கள் ஆளப்படவில்லை. சாதி, குலம் என்ற பொருளிலேயே குடி என்ற சொல் சிலப்பதிகாரத்தில் ஆளப்பட்டுள்ளது. பின் வருவன சான்றுகளாகும் :

" ஒரு தனிக் குடிகளொ டுயர்ந்தோங்கு செல்வத்தான் "
(மங்கலவாழ்த்துப் பாடல் : 32)

" ஏசாச் சிறப்பின் இசைவிளங்கு பெருங்குடி "
(வழக்குரை காதை : 57)

" செவ்வி பார்க்கும் செழுங்குடிச் செல்வரொடு "
(ஊர் காண் காதை - 144)

"வீயாத் திருவின் விழுக்குடிப் பிறந்த தாய வேந்தர்"
(கட்டுரை காதை : 143-144)

"மன்பதை காக்கும் நன்குடிப் பிறத்தல்"
(காட்சிக் காதை : 108)

"...............எங்குடிப் பிறந்தோர்க்குச்
சிறப்பொடு வரூஉஞ் செய்கையோ அன்று."
(காட்சிக் காதை : 124-125)

ஆளப்படுவோர் என்ற பொருளிலும் குடிகள் என்னும் சொல் சிலப்பதிகாரத்தில் ஆளப்பட்டுள்ளது. பின் வருவன சான்று பகரு கின்றன.

"கொடுங்கோல் வேந்தன் குடிகள் போல"
(புறஞ்சேரியிறுத்த காதை : 15)

"மன்பழி தூற்றும் குடியதே மாமதுரை" (ஊர் சூழ்வரி : 28)

"குடிபழி தூற்றும் கோலனும் அல்லன்" (கட்டுரை காதை: 34)

"குடிநடுக் குறூஉம் கோலே னுகென" (கால்கோட்காதை : 18)

"குடிபுறந் தருங்கால் திருமுகம் போல" (நடுகற்காதை : 38)

"குடிபுற வுண்டும் கொடுங்கோலஞ்சி" (காட்சிக் காதை : 102)

'தொழிலாளர்' என்ற சொல்,

"கோத்தொழி லாளரொடு கொற்றவன் கோடி"
(காடு காண் காதை : 60)

என்ற இடத்து ஆளப்பட்டிருப்பினும் முதலாளி தொழிலாளி வேற்றுமையுணர்ச்சி அச்சொற்பொருளில் ஒலிக்கவில்லை. இக்காலக் கொள்கைகள், இக்காலப் பொருளிலுள்ள இக்காலச் சொற்கள் இவற்றின் துணை கொண்டு அக்கால இலக்கியங்களை ஆராய்ச்சி செய்தலில் உள்ள இடர்ப்பாடுகள் ஒருவாறு புலனுகும். அதனுல் அத்தகைய ஆராய்ச்சி பயன் தருமா என்ற ஐயமும் முளைக்கிறது.

சிலப்பதிகாரம் செல்வர்களின் வாழ்க்கையை இயம்புகிறது. எனவே, அதனைக் குடி மக்கள் காப்பியமெனலாமா என்னும் ஐயம் தோன்றுகிறது. முதலாளி இலக்கியம் அல்லது மேன்மக்கள் இலக்கியம் என்று அதனைக் கூறவும் உள்ளம் தூண்டுகிறது.

கோவலன் கண்ணகி இருவரும் செல்வக் குடியினர். கண்ணகியின் செல்வவாழ்வின் வளனையும் அவள் பெற்ருேர்

செல்வமேம்பாட்டையும் இளங்கோ அடிகள்,

“நாகநீள் நகரொடு நாகநா டதனெடு
போகநீள் புகழ்மன்னும் புகார்நக ரதுதன்னில்
மாகவான் நிகர்வண்கை மாநாய்கன் குலக்கொம்பர்
ஈகைவான் கொடியன்னுள் ஈராருண் டகவையாள் ”

(மங்கல வாழ்த்துப் பாடல் : 21-24)

என்று சுவை நலம் மிளிரப் பாடுகிருர்.

செல்வருக்குள் பெருஞ்செல்வனுய், முதலாளிகளுக்குள் பெரு முதலாளியாய்க் கோவலன் தந்தை விளங்கினுன். பணக்காரருள் ராக்பெல்லர், போர்டு என்பார் எவ்வாறு முதன்மை வாய்ந்தவராகக் கருதப்படும் புகழ்பெற்றனரோ, அவ்வாறே மாசாத்துவானும் பெரும் புகழ் படைத்தான். அவனே இருநிதிக் கிழவனும் குபேரனென்று இளங்கோ அடிகள் அக்கால மரபிற்கு ஏற்பப் பாராட்டுகிருர்.

“பெருநில முழுதாளும் பெருமகன் தலைவைத்த
ஒருதனிக் குடிகளொ டுயர்ந்தோங்கு செல்வத்தான்
வருநிதி பிறர்க்கார்த்து மாசாத்து வானென்பான்
இருநிதிக் கிழவன்மகன் ஈரெட்டாண் டகவையான்.”

(மங்கல வாழ்த்துப் பாடல் : 31-34)

என்று இளங்கோ கோவலனை நமக்கு அறிமுகம் செய்கிருர்.

கோவலன் கண்ணகி திருமணம், செல்வர்களின் பெருமை, பொருட்சிறப்பு விளங்க நடைபெற்றதாக மங்கல வாழ்த்துப் பாடல் விரித்து உரைக்கிறது. அரசன் உலாச் செல்லுங்கால் திகழும் செல்வமிடுக்கு அனைத்தும் நம் கண் முன் காட்டுகிருர் செம்புலச் செல்வர் இளங்கோ அடிகள்.

“முரசியம்பின முருடதிர்ந்தன முறையெழுந்தன
பணிலம்—வெண்குடை
அரசெழுந்ததோர் படியெழுந்தன.”

(மங்கல வாழ்த்துப் பாடல் : 46-47)

கோவலன் கண்ணகி தனிக் குடும்ப வாழ்க்கையை விளக்கும் இளங்கோ அடிகள், அவர்கள் செல்வவாழ்வு வாழ்ந்தார்கள் என் பதைக் குறிப்பிடுகிருர். ஏழை மக்கள், நடுத்தர வகுப்பினர் வாழும் சேரியிலோ, நகர்ப்பகுதியிலோ, அவர்களை இளங்கோ நமக்குக் காட்டவில்லை; பணம் படைத்தோர் வாழும் இடம் என்பதை உறுதிப்படுத்த, அவர்களைக் குடிசையில் காட்டாமல், நிரை நிலை மாடத்தின் அரமியத்தில் மயன் விதித்தன்ன மணிக்கால் அமளி மிசைக் காட்டுகிருர். செல்வத்திலே அவர்கள் திளைத்த பெற்றியை

" விருந்து புறந்தரூஉம் பெருந்தண் வாழ்க்கையும்
வேறுபடு திருவின் வீறுபெறக் காண
உரிமைச் சுற்றமொ டொருதனி புணர்க்க
யாண்டுசில கழிந்தன இற்பெருங் கிழமையிற்
காண்டகு சிறப்பிற் கண்ணகி தனக்கென் "

(மனையறம் படுத்த காதை : 86-90)

என்று கூறுகிறார்.

பணக்காரக் குடும்ப இளைஞர்களைப் போலக் கோவலனையும் காமவேட்கையுடையவனாக இளங்கோ படைக்கிறார். மாதவியின் பரிசு மாலையை ஆயிரத்தெட்டுக் கழஞ்சுக்கு வாங்கும் கோவலன் செல்வச் செருக்கையும், ஒழுக்கக் குறைவையும், துரோகச் செயலையும் அரங்கேற்று காதையில் காண முடிகிறது. அவன் காம வேட்கையின் ஆழத்தை,

" விடுதல் அறியா விருப்பினன் ஆயினன்
வடுநீங்கு சிறப்பின்தன் மனையகம் மறந்தென்."

(அரங்கேற்று காதை : 174-175)

என்று இளங்கோ கூறுகிறார்.

ஒழுக்க உறுதிப்பாடற்ற பணக்கார இளைஞர்க்குத் தூர்த்தர் நட்பு விரைவில் வாய்த்தல் இயல்பு. செல்வ இளைஞன் கோவலனுக்கும் தீயோர் நட்பு வாய்த்தது. பாணராகவும் பரத்தராகவும் அத்தீயோர் விளங்கினர் என்பதை,

" குரல்வாய்ப் பாணரொடு நகரப் பரத்தரொடு
திரிதரு மரபிற் கோவலன் போல
இளிவாய் வண்டினொ டின்னிள வேனிலொடு
மலய மாருதம் திரிதரு மறுகில் "

(இந்திர விழவூரெடுத்த காதை : 200-203)

என்று இளங்கோ அழகு நலம் தோன்றக் கூறுகிறார்.

பணக்காரர் வாழ்வில் வேலையாட்கள் இடம்பெறுவார்கள். செல்வ இளைஞனான கோவலனும் ஏவலாட்கள் புடை சூழ எங்கும் திரிந்தான். மாதவியை விட்டுப் பிரியும் பொழுதும் அவன் ஏவலாளர் சூழச் சென்றதாகக் காட்டுகிறார்.

" ஏவலாள ருடன்சூழ்தரக் கோவலன்தான் போனபின்னர் "

(கானல் வரி)

மாதவியுடன் வாழ்ந்த போதும் கணிகையர் பலர் ஏவலாளராய் இருந்தனர்.

செல்வக் குடிப் பிறந்த நங்கை கண்ணகிக்கு ஏவல் செய்யக் காத்திருந்தோர் பலர். செல்வச் செழுமையால் அவளுக்கு வாய்த்த தோழியர் பலர். குடிமுதற்சுற்றமும் குற்றிளையோரும் அடியோர் பாங்கும் ஆயமும் அவளுக்கு, அவள் செல்வச் செழிப்பிற்கு, அடி பணிந்து பணியாற்றப் பின்னடையவில்லை. மாதவியைப் பிரிந்து வரும் கோலலன் வரவை,

"காவலன் போலும் கடைத்தலையான் வந்துநம்
கோவலன் என்றுளோர் குற்றிளையாள்"

(கனுத்திறமுரைத்த காதை : 65-66)

என்றே இளங்கோ கூறுகிறுர்.

பணக்காரர் கார், விமானம் போன்ற ஊர்திகளில் இவர்ந்து செல்லுதலையும்; உல்லாசப் பிரயாணங்கள், இன்பப் பொழுது போக்குகளில் நலம் துய்த்தலையும் முதலாளி இலக்கியம் எடுத்தியம் புதல் உண்டு. இளங்கோ அடிகளும், கோவலனும் மாதவியும் அக்கால ஊர்திகளாகிய அத்திரி, வையம் இவற்றில் இவர்ந்து சென்ற இந்திர விழாவில் நடைபெற்ற கலை நிகழ்ச்சிகளைக் கண்டு இன்பந்துய்த்துக் கடல் நீராட்டிலும் திளைத்ததாகக் கூறுகிறுர். கடற்கரையில்,

"புன்னை நீழற் புதுமணற் பரப்பில்
ஓவிய எழினி சூழவுடன் போக்கி
விதானித்துப் படுத்த வெண்கால் அமளிமிசை'

(கடலாடு காதை : 168-170)

இருந்து இன்னிசை இன்பம் மாந்தினர் என்று கூறுங்காலும் அவர்கள் செல்வச் செருக்கையே இளங்கோ காட்டுகிறுர்.

பணக்கார இளைஞரின் காமவேட்கை அவர்களின் செல்வத்தை அழித்து வளமான வாழ்விற்கு முற்றுப்புள்ளியிட்டுவிடுவதாக முதலாளி இலக்கியம் கூறும். அவ்வாறே சிலப்பதிகாரமும் கோவல னுடைய காமவேட்கை அவன் குபேர செல்வத்தைக் கரைத்துக் குடித்து ஏப்பம் விட்டதாகக் கூறுகிறது. அவன் வான் தோய் வாழ்வு சரிந்ததும் ஏவலாளர் தொண்டு, அத்திரி, வையம், செல்வச் செருக்கு யாவும் அவனுக்குப் பிரிவுரை கூறின.

"சலம்புணர் கொள்கைச் சலதியொ டாடிக்
குலந்தரு வான்பொருட் குன்றம் தொலைத்த
இலம்பாடு நாணுத் தருமெனக்கு !"

(கனுத்திறமுரைத்த காதை : 69-71)

என்று தளர்ந்து இடிந்து கண்ணகிக்குக் கோவலன் கூறி வருந்தியதாக இளங்கோ குறிப்பிடுகிருர். அதன்பின் ஏவலாள ரின்றி, அத்திரி, வையம் இவற்றில் இவர்ந்து செல்லப் பொரு ளின்றிக் கண்ணகியை அழைத்து இரவோடு இரவாக மதுரைக்குப் புறப்பட்டதாக இளங்கோ கூறுகிருர். கால்களில் கொப்புளங்கள் பெருகி நோவக் கண்ணகி ஏழை வீட்டுப் பெண் போல நெடுந் தொலேவு நடந்ததாகவும் கதை செல்கிறது.

> "குடி முதற் சுற்றமும் குற்றிளே யோரும்
> அடியோர் பாங்கும் ஆயமும் நீங்கி
> நாணமும் மடனும் நல்லோர் ஏத்தும்
> பேணிய கற்பும் பெருந்துணே யாக
> என்ஞெடு போந்து" (கொலேக்களக் காதை : 84-88)

என்று கூறிக் கோவலன் வருந்தியதாக இளங்கோ காட்டு கிருர். செல்வத்திலே பிறந்து, செல்வத்திலே திளேத்து, இளமை விளேயாட்டுக்களால் குலந்தரு வான்பொருட்குன்றம் தொலேய வறுமையில் வாடி வதங்க நேரிட்டதே என்ற கோவலனின் குமுறலே இளங்கோ அழகு நலம் தோயத் தீட்டியுள்ளார்.

பின் வறுமையின் பிடியை விடுவிக்கக் கோவலன் முயன்ற தாகவும், கண்ணகியின் காற்சிலம்பை விற்கக் கோவலன் மதுரை சென்றதாகவும், விதியின் சதியாற் பொற்கொல்லன் சூழ்ச்சியால் கோவலன் கொல்லப்பட்டதாகவும் இளங்கோ கூறுகிருர்.

இவ்வாறு செல்வக் குடும்பத்தில் பிறந்த இருவர் திருமணம், அன்ஞர் செல்வச் சிறப்பு, அவர்கள் வாழ்க்கையில் பரத்தை யொருத்தியின் தலேயீடு, காம ஈடுபாட்டால் செல்வம் கரைதல், வறுமையின் பிடி, வறுமை மீட்சிப் போராட்டம், விதியின் சதி என்ற இவற்றைக் கூறலால் சிலப்பதிகாரம் முதலாளி இலக்கியம் அல்லது மேன்மக்கள் இலக்கியம் என்ற எண்ணம் உள்ளத்தில் நிழலாடுகிறது.

வேடர், இடையர், குறவர், உழவர் முதலிய உழைப்பாளிகளின் வாழ்க்கை இடையிடையே கோவலன் கண்ணகி கதையோடு பின்னப்படுகிறது. வேட்டுவ வரியில் வேடர் வாழ்க்கை, அவர்கள் ஆடல், பாடல், வழிபாடு என்பன கூறப்படுகின்றன. ஆய்ச்சியர் குரவையில் இடையர் வாழ்க்கை படம் பிடிக்கப்படுகிறது. குன்றக்குரவை காட்சிக் காதைகளில் குறவர் வாழ்வு காட்டப்படு கிறது. உழவர் வாழ்வு, வயல் வளம், அவர்கள் உழைப்பு என்பன நாடு காண் காதையில் விரிவாகக் கூறப்படுகின்றன. நால்வகை

நில மக்கள் வாழ்வு நீர்ப்படைக் காதையில் அழகுக் கோவையாகக் காட்சியளிக்கின்றது. பொதுமக்கள் வாழ்வும் எண்ணமும் ஊர் காண் காதை, ஊர்சூழ் வரி, அழற்படுகாதைகளிலும், பிற காதை களில் ஆங்காங்குச் சிற்சில பகுதிகளிலும் காட்சியளிக்கின்றன. இவ்வாறு ஏழைகள், தொழிலாளர், குடி மக்கள் ஆகியோர் வாழ்வு, எண்ணம், இன்பதுன்பங்கள் யாவும் சிலப்பதிகாரத்தில் எழில் மிக்க பின்னணியில் காட்சியளிப்பினும், வேடர் முதலிய பாட்டாளி களின் வாழ்க்கையைக் கூறல் சிலப்பதிகாரத்தின் கருவாக அமைய வில்லை. கோவலன் கண்ணகி இருவரின் வாழ்க்கைப் போராட்டமே கதையின் கருவாதலால் சிலப்பதிகாரம் முதலாளி இலக்கியம் என்ற எண்ணம் மறையவில்லை.

செல்வக் குடிப் பிறப்பு, செல்வவாழ்வு, ஒழுக்கக் குறைவு என் , பன கோவலன்பால் காணப்பட்டாலும், முதலாளிகட்கு இருக்க வேண்டிய இரக்கமற்ற கொடுமை, ஏமாற்று வித்தை, பிறன் உழைப்பை உறிஞ்சுதல் ஆகிய அமிசங்கள் அவனிடம் இல்லை. ஆனால், உண்மைத் தொழிலாளியிடம் காணப்பட வேண்டிய பிறன் துன்பம் நீக்கல், தன்னம்பிக்கை, உழைப்பின் மேன்மையை யுணர்தல் ஆகிய பண்புகள் கோவலனிடம் குடி கொண்டன.

மதம் பிடித்த களிறு மறையோனைப் பற்றிய போது அதனை அடக்கி அவனை மீட்டான் கோவலன். பிறர் துன்பம் உணரா இரக்கமற்ற அரக்க உள்ளம் படைத்த முதலாளியாகக் கோவலன் இருந்திருப்பின், மறையவனை மீட்டிருப்பானா? அடிமைகள் அரி யேறுகளுடன் அடலமர் புரியும் காட்சியைக் கண்டு களிக்கும் உரோம மேன்மகனாக அன்றோ மாறியிருப்பான்! பிறப்பால் சூழலால் முதலாளியாய் இருந்தும் உள்ளத்தில் உண்மை உழைப் பாளனின் இரக்க உணர்வு செறிந்திருந்தமையால் அன்றோ,

“ மையிருங் குன்றின் விஞ்சையன் ஏய்ப்பப்
பிடர்த்தலை இருந்து பெருஞ்சினம் பிறழாக்
கடக்களி றடக்கிய கருணை மறவ !”

(அடைக்கலக் காதை : 51-53)

என்று மாமறையோன் மாடலன் பாராட்டினான் ?

பிள்ளை நகுலத்தைக் கொன்றமையால் கணவனால் துறக்கப் பட்ட அருமறையாட்டி அருந்துயர் களைவோரைத் தேடியலைந்த போது,

“ அஞ்சல் ! உன்றன் அருந்துயர் களைகேன் ;
நெஞ்சுறு துயரம் நீங்குக !” (அடைக்கலக் காதை : 68-69)

என்று கூறித் துயர் களைந்தான் கோவலன்; அன்றியும் அவர்கள் வாழ்வுக்கு வேண்டிய பொருளும் கொடுத்தான். செல்வர்களின் அரக்க இதயம், ஈயாமை ஆகியவற்றை இங்கும் காணமுடியவில்லை.

" தீத்திறம் புரிந்தோள் செய்துயர் நீங்கத்
தானம் செய்தவள் தன்துயர் நீக்கிக்
கானம் போன கணவனைக் கூட்டி
ஒல்காச் செல்வத் துறுபொருள் கொடுத்து
நல்வழிப் படுத்த செல்லாச் செல்வ !"

(அடைக்கலக் காதை : 71-75)

என்றே அவன் அன்பு நெஞ்சம் பாராட்டப்படுகிறது.

கணவனையிழந்த மாசற்ற பத்தினிக்கும் அவள் கிளைகட்கும் பல்லாண்டு பொருளுதவினான் கோலலன் என்றொரு நிகழ்ச்சியையும் இளங்கோ குறிப்பிடுகிறார். மீண்டும் உண்மையுழைப்பாளனின் கருணையுள்ளத்தையே இளங்கோ காட்டுகிறார்.

" அழிதரும் உள்ளத் தவளொடும் போந்தவன்
சுற்றத் தோர்க்கும் தொடர்புறு கிளைகட்கும்
பற்றிய கிளைஞரிற் பசிப்பிணி யறுத்துப்
பல்லாண்டு புரந்த இல்லோர் செம்மல் "

(அடைக்கலக் காதை : 87-90)

என்ற அடிகள் சான்று பகர்கின்றன.

தன்னம்பிக்கை, உழைப்பில் ஊக்கம் ஆகிய உழைப்பாளர் பண்புகளும் கோவலனை அணி செய்தன. குலந்தரு வான் பொருட்குன்றம் தொலைத்த இலம்பாடு நாணம் தருவதாகக் கூறிய கோவலன், உழைப்பால் உயரலாம் என்ற உறுதியும் தன்னம்பிக்கையும் இருந்தமையாலன்றோ,

" சிலம்பு முதலாகச் சென்ற கலனொடு
உலந்தபொருள் ஈட்டுதல் உற்றேன் மலர்ந்தசீர்
மாட மதுரை யகத்துச்சென்று "

(கனாத்திறமுரைத்த காதை : 74-76)

என்று கண்ணகிக்குக் கூறினான். உறுதியும் தன்னம்பிக்கையும் பற்றியன்றோ "ஈட்டலுறுவேன்" எனக் கூற வேண்டியவன் "ஈட்டுதலுற்றேன்" என்று மொழிந்தான்?

உழைப்பின் உயர்வை உணராதவன் கோவலனாயின், அவன் பெற்றோரும் கண்ணகி பெற்றோரும் தம் பொருளைத் தானமாக

வழங்கித் துறவு மேற்கொள்வானேன்? கோவலன், பெற்ருேர் மாமனர் பொருட்செல்வத்தைச் சுரண்டாமல், பொருளீட்ட மதுரை செல்வானேன்? எனவே, கோவலன் உழைப்பின் பெருமையில் உறுதியுள்ளவன், உழைத்தற்குப் பின் வாங்காதவன் என்பது திண்ணம். அதனுலேயே,

"கோவலன் தாதை கொடுந்துயர் எய்தி
மாபெருந் தானமா வான்பொருள் ஈந்தாங்கு
....
துறந்தோர் தம்முன் துறவி யெய்தவும்"

....
கண்ணகி தாதை கடவுளர் கோலத்து
அண்ணலம் பெருந்தவத் தாசீ வகர்முன்
புண்ணிய தானம் புரிந்தறங் கொள்ளவும்"
(நீர்ப்படைக் காதை : *90-95, 98-100*)

நேரிட்டதாக மாடலன் கூறினுன். கண்ணகியும் உழைப்பின் மேன்மையை உணர்ந்தவள்.

"அறிவும் ஒழுக்கமும் யாண்டுஉணர்ந் தனள்கொல்!
கொண்ட கொழுநன் குடிவற னுற்றெனக்
கொடுத்த தந்தை கொழுஞ்சோ றுள்ளாள்" (நற்றிணை : *110*)

என்று போதனுர் கூறுந் தமிழ்க்குடி நங்கையின் வழித்தோன்றல் கண்ணகியாதலால் அன்ருே தன் தந்தை பொருளை உள்ளாது அவள் கோவலன் உழைப்பின் பயனையே துய்க்க விரும்பினுள்?

எனவே, பிறப்பால், தோற்றத்தால், சூழலால், கோவலன் முதலாளியாகக் காணப்பட்டாலும், உள்ளப் பண்பால் எண்ணத் தால் உழைப்பாளி என்றே இளங்கோ காட்டுகிருர். அதனுல், புறத் தோற்றத்தில் சிலப்பதிகாரம் முதலாளி இலக்கியமென நிழலிடு கிறது. உண்மைப் பண்பால் குடி மக்கள் காப்பியமாக ஒளி வீசுகிறது.

சிலப்பதிகாரம் இவ்வாறு புதுமைத் தோற்றம் அளிப்பதன் காரணம், அக்காலத் தமிழகத்தின் பண்பு மேம்பாடு என்றே கூற வேண்டும். சிலப்பதிகார காலத்தில் உலகின் ஏனைய பாகங்களில் முடியரசு அன்பிற்கும் அறத்திற்கும் புறம்பாக விளங்கத் தமிழகத் தில் அன்போடும் அறத்தோடும் பிணைந்தே விளங்கியது. அவ்வாறே உலகின் ஏனைய பாகங்களில் பணக்காரர், மேன்

மக்கள் ஆகியோர் இரக்கமில்லாக் கொடியராய் வாழத் தமிழகத்தில் தமக்கென வாழாப் பிறர்க்குரியாளராகச் செல்வர் வாழ்ந்தனர்.

"செல்வத்துப் பயனே ஈதல்
துய்ப்பே மெனினே தப்புன பலவே." (புறம் : *189*)

எனவும்,

" பகுத்துண்டு பல்லுயிர் ஓம்புதல் நூலோர்
தொகுத்தவற்றுள் எல்லாம் தலை." (குறள் : *322*)

எனவும் தங்கள் குறிக்கோளை அவர்கள் வகுத்தார்கள். அதனுலன்றே ஜார் மன்னனுக்கு எதிராக இரஷ்யமக்கள் புரட்சி செய்து முடியரசிற்கு முற்றுப் புள்ளியிட்டதுபோலத் தாங்களும் செய்யாது மதுரை மக்கள்,

" களையாத துன்பமிக் காரிகைக்குக் காட்டி
வளையாத செங்கோல் வளைந்த திதுவென்கொல் !"
(ஊர்சூழ் வரி : *17-18*)

என்று இனையன சொல்லித் தூற்றுவதோடு அமைதியுற்றுர்கள் ?

Hints Regarding the Origin of the Present Tense Suffix 'kinr' in Tamil

M. ANDRONOV

Three suffixes of the present tense, namely āniṉr, kiṉr and kiṟ, are given in the medieval Tamil grammar Naṉṉūl.[1] Morphological heterogeneity of the first suffix is obvious. Forms like ceyyāniṉṟāṉ "he does" naṭavāniṉṟāṉ "he walks" consist of verbal participles (viṉai-y-eccam) in= ā and past tense forms of the verb nil = "to stand, to stop, to stay", i.e., ceyyāniṉṟāṉ < ceyyā "doing" + niṉṟāṉ "he stayed", naṭavāniṉṟāṉ < naṭavā "walking" + niṉṟāṉ "he stayed", etc. This structure of the "suffix" āniṉr is proved by the fact that the verb nil =, which is a part of it, can itself vary in tenses and sometimes is put in the future tense, e.g., tamiḷ nūlāciriyar .... kūṟānirpar "Tamil authors state..."[2]

Two other suffixes kiṉr and kiṟ are definitely two forms of one suffix.[3] As Dr. R. Caldwell notes, it is Dr. K. Graul who has suggested first[4] that the suffix kiṉr consists of the aorist-future suffix ku and the word iṉṟu "to-day, now" which specifies an indefinite form in ku. This suggestion was supported afterwards by R. Caldwell and H. Gundert.[5] Later the same view was expressed by

---

1 'aninru kinru kirumu vitattin
aimpa nikalpolu taraivinai yitainilai' (Nan. 143)

2 V. G. Suryanarayana Sastriyar, *History of the Tamil Language*, Madura, 1953, pp. 61-62. According to V. G. Suryanarayana Sastriyar, the verb nil =, when used in this way, can be put in the past, in the present, or in the future tense: ceyya ninran, ceyya nirkiran, ceyya nirpan (cf. ibid., p. 75).

3 R. Caldwell, *A Comparative Grammar of the Dravidian or South-Indian Family of Languages*, 3d ed., London, 1913, p. 494.

4 K. Graul, *Outline of Tamil Grammar*, Leipzig, 1855.

5 R. Caldwell, ibid.

A. M. Mervart in his Tamil Grammar published in Russian: "That which is new in these forms (cey-k-in̲r̲-ēn, cey-k-ir̲ēn̲. — M.A.), — he writes, — is an element which has a shape of in̲r̲ or ir̲. The former phonetic complex is obviously the word in̲r̲u "now, to-day". By suffixation of this word in̲r̲u the time of action is fixed exactly, and instead of cey-k-ēn̲ which means "doing is mine", i.e. "I do" or "I shall do", we get cey-k-in̲r̲-ēn̲ (< ceyku-in̲r̲u-ēn̲) which thus acquires a definite meaning of "doing is mine now", i.e. "I am doing now"; ir̲u is denasalised in̲r̲u (cf. in̲r̲u "to-day" but ir̲r̲ai "to-day's, of to-day")."[6]

At present derivation of the suffix kin̲r̲ from the word in̲r̲u "to-day" looks unprobable. J. Bloch after comparing present tense forms in Brāhūī and in Southern Dravidian languages comes to the conclusion that the present tense suffixes in Telugu (unn) and Tamil (kir̲) are actually roots of auxiliary verbs which are not employed independently and attach personal terminations in the present tense directly to the root: this is characteristic of the present tense Brāhūī as well as of some auxiliary verbs in Telugu (kal — "to be", gal — "can", paḍ — "to suffer") and in Kurukh (arg — "not to have").[7]

However, there are some grounds to believe that the derivation of the present tense suffix kir̲ cannot be absolutely completed with postulating a root *kir̲ that first was independent and then turned into a suffix. As shown by E. H. Tuttle, Tamil r̲ is a derivative of l, n̲, or r in contact with a voiceless sound.[8]

---

[6] A. M. Mervart, *Grammatika Tamiljskogo Razgovornogo Jazyka*, Leningrad, 1929, p. 72. Criticism of such treatment of finite forms by A. M. Mervart see in K. Zvelebil, *A Note on Tamil Verbal Morphology*, "Archiv Orientalni", 1955, XXIII, pp. 479-80.

[7] J. Bloch, *Structure Gnammaticale des Langues Dravidiennes*, Paris, 1946, p. 59.

[8] E. H. Tuttle, Review of K. Ramakrishnaiah's "*Studies in Dravidian Philology*", JAOS, vol. 57, p. 115; *The History of Tamil R*, ibid., pp. 411-15.

Therefore kir and especially kinr cannot be original forms and must be traced to some other root, e.g., *kil.[9]

If J. Bloch and E. Tuttle are right a question must arise about the second element concealed in the last sound of the suffix kir (< kinr).

Comparison of the present tense suffixes āninr (< ā-nil+t) and kinr makes us believe that in kinr also we may probably have a past tense base of some root, i.e. a root to which the past tense suffix t is attached : kinr < kil+t. This explains why personal terminations are suffixed directly to ki(n)r : verbal roots in Tamil do not generally take any personal terminations. In fact ki(n)r is not a root but a past tense base, and personal terminations are suffixed to it in complete conformity with grammar (cf. ninr-ēn, ninr-āy, ninr-ān, etc.). At any rate, it is obvious that if at a certain period of history of Tamil there was no special suffix to denote the present tense,[10] then in a later period, when it became necessary to delimit clearly present tense forms from those of the past and future, the language should have to resort to lexical means of expressing this notion on the basis of resources already available in it at that time. In case of ā-ninr it was periphrasis of the verbal participle in -ā and past forms of nil-. The suffix kinr (< kir), irresolvable now, could arise in an analogous way.

Distribution of k : kk in the suffix (k)kinr is not caused by any phonological reasons, but it is connected with the classification of verbs into weak and strong (cf.

---

[9] In this connection it is possible to note a verbal root kil,- "to be able" which can be suffixed to some other verb to indicate ability (see Tamil Lexicon).

[10] The suffix ki(n)r is not to be found in the oldest Tamil texts. Cf. : R. Caldwell, ibid. ; K. Zvelebil, *Tentative Periodization of Tamil*, "Tamil Culture", 1957, vol. VI, No. I, pp. 50-52. Before the suffix kinr arises, K. Zvelebil writes, "the verb has two tenses (aorist-future and preterite) which seem to be rather aspects (momentaneous-durative, perfective-imperfective) than tenses" (ibid., p. 51). For the first time kinr appears in Late Middle Tamil (ibid., p. 54).

mar̲aikin̲r̲ēn̲ and mar̲aikkin̲r̲ēn̲, tarukin̲r̲ēn̲ and irukkin̲r̲ēn̲). This fact stands in favour of Dr. K. Graul's suggestion that (k)k in (k)kin̲r̲ is a suffix of the aorist-future. Therefore it seems impossible to consider (k)in̲r̲ an indivisible suffix. Our suggestion is that (k)kin̲r̲ consists of (k)k, a suffix attached to the root of the main verb, and in̲r̲, the past tense base (= root + t) of another verb. Once independent, it was used (like nin̲r̲, the past tense base of nil- "to stand, to stay") to express the meaning of the present tense and later, after merging with (k)k, turned into an indivisible suffix of the present tense: (k)kin̲r̲ < (k)ku + in̲r̲ < (k)ku + il + t.[11]

What is the nature of the root il- which is, as we can see it now, a basis of the present tense suffix kin̲r̲? In what relation does it stand to the negative root il-?

There are two negative roots in Tamil, il- and al- "not to be". Different opinions have been expressed about the original meaning of these roots. Dr. R. Caldwell thinks, for instance, that such words like an̲r̲u "it is not", an̲mai "notness, negation", alku- "to become less", al "darkness", alvaḷi "absence of inflexion", in̲r̲u "it is not", in̲mai "non-existence", ili "one who has nothing", etc., show that the negative meaning lies in the root itself.[12] H. Gundert,[13] F. Kittel,[14] and G. U. Pope,[15] on the contrary, contend that the negative meaning should be connected with the form of words, while the very roots il- and al- have nothing to do with it. "Illai (really illē) and alla, G. U. Pope writes, are negative forms of two old positive roots, il = ir = be, and al = ar = befit."[16]

---

11 This root (il-) could not look like *ir- since the roots in -r have -nt- in the past tense and undergo no morphophonemic changes; in- is a variant of il- (cf. inmai < il-mai).

12 R. Caldwell, ibid., pp. 476-77.

13 Cf. ibid.

14 F. Kittel, *A Grammar of the Kannada Language*, Mangalore, 1903, p. 160.

15 G. U. Pope, *A Handbook of the Ordinary Dialect of the Tamil Language*, Oxford, 1904, p. 96.

16 Ibid.

Such negative forms of the verb iru- "to be" as irātu "it is not, it will be not", irār "they are not, they will be not", etc., show, however, that negative forms of this verb are construed not by the interchange r : l but by suffixation of the negative ā (< a)[17] to the root.

At the same time, there is at least one positive form in Modern Tamil derived from the roots il- and al-, namely infinitives, as in illavē illai, allavē alla "not in the least, not at all" (cf.: māṭṭavē māṭṭēṉ "I will not", teriyavē teriyātē "it is absolutely unknown", kāṇavē kāṇōm "no trace is visible", vēṇṭavē vēṇṭā "absolutely unnecessary", etc.). This testifies to the fact that il- and al- are two independent roots from which both positive and negative forms can be derived.

It is difficult to determine the primary meaning of the roots il- and al-. Most probably they could not originally have such an abstract negative meaning as they have now but should have denoted some specific action or condition.[18] In the course of time that specific meaning grew weaker and weaker, and the word gradually came to express abstract negation. The same process is developing now in the instance of the verb māṭṭu- "to attach, to fix" where negative forms are used in the sense of negative verbs "shall not, will not": ceyya māṭṭēṉ "I shall not do", "I will not do", "I am not inclined to do", "I am not going to do". Dr. R. Caldwell's examples, which he quotes as a proof of primary negativeness of these roots, ought to be the result of later development.

To conclude, the verbs il- and al- could not have been originally only negative in their meaning. Like the verb

---

17 Cf. V. I. Subramaniam, *Negatives*, "Tamil Culture", 1959, vol. VIII, No. I.

18 S. Gnana Prakasar thinks, for example, that the root il- originally had the meaning "to slip away" and the root al- meant "to knit together" (S. Gnana Prakasar, *An Etymological and Comparative Lexicon of the Tamil Language*, vol. I, Chunnakam, 1938, p. IV). However, this etymology cannot be considered final.

māṭṭu- "to attach, to fix", they had had specific lexical meaning and a full paradigm in the positive and negative forms. Gradually their lexical meaning grew more and more abstract and then completely died away. Positive forms of these verbs got out of use, and negative forms came to denote abstract negation. Since there was no opposition of positive forms, the negative meaning ceased to be connected with a form — negative form — of these verbs and was associated with the very roots. This gave an opportunity to arise to such forms which expressed negation only by their roots.

The only positive forms of il- and al- to be found now are infinitives which are widely used till the present day.

Positive forms of the past tense of the verb il- can be traced in medieval and modern forms of the present tense in (k)kinr (cf. arikinrān "he knows" ariku + inrān and arikilan "he doesn't know" < ariku + ilan, the corresponding negative form of il-).[19]

---

[19] It seems quite probable that in varukirpatu (Tirunavukkaracar, Tevāram, Cennai, 1957, p. 525) we have a form of the future tense of il-: varukirpatu varuku + irpatu (cf. the use of the future tense of nil with verbal participles in -ā to give the meaning of the present tense). Tamil Lexicon cites this word as an example of the ṣuffix kil expressing ability.

The Tamil Book of Proverbs

REV. H. S. DAVID

Introduction and Plan of this and of the next Article

1. Its peculiar diction, compared with the earliest Tamil classics, especially the Kuṟuntokai and its parallel anthologies.
2. The internal evidence of certain stanzas in this work.
3. The common structure of the 399 stanzas of this book.
4. The arrangement of these stanzas according to topics, with some comparisons with the Nālaṭi, herein referred to as Nāl.
5. The proverbs proper: a few selections, besides those mentioned under 1 and 2.
6. How we should appreciate this work: its place, considering the above points, (*a*) in time and (*b*) in merit and importance among the 18 *minor* classics: பதினெண் கீழ்க்கணக்கு.

THE INTRODUCTION

Two years ago, in Vol. VII, No. 4 of *Tamil Culture* I published my critical appreciation of one of our ancient 18 *major* classics: பதினெண் மேற்கணக்கு namely, the Kuṟuntokai. Now I shall do the same for one of our ancient 18 *minor* classics, the Paḷamoḷi. This book is not so well-known as some of its companion-works, like the Tirukkuṟaḷ and the Nālaṭi. It is my contention that it is well worth our study as *thoroughly representative of Late Classical times,* confining the word "Classical" to connote what are generally called "Sangham" works. For obvious reasons I avoid this latter word in all my theses and articles.

I-A. The peculiar diction of the Tamil Book of Proverbs compared with that of the earliest classical works, as an index to the time and place of its composition.

As I have already introduced the readers of *Tamil Culture* to the Kur̲untokai anthology (Vol. VII, No. 4, Oct., 1958) I shall cite mainly therefrom and from its parallel anthologies, like Aka Nā. (AN.) and Pur̲a Nā (PN.).

1. ampuli = the moon, cantiran̲, C. This word does not occur in the earliest classics, like the Kur̲un.* To every Tamilian child, however, it is familiar from the nursery rhyme, அம்புலி மாமா, அழகழக சொக்கா .... To this Paḷ. 264c alludes : பிள்ளைகளை மருட்டும் தாயர்போல் அம்புலி மேல்.

2. al¹ = distress, Com. tun̲pam அல் உறினும், Paḷ. 273a. This monosyllabic word is evidently shorter and earlier than the ordinary word from this base, allal, அல்லல், as at Kur̲un. 43:5 and 381:2 allal neñcamoṭu. The verbal form corresponding to this monosyllabic noun is ala- to incur distress, வறுமை உறு ; this form too is to be found in Paḷ. as at 101a (twice), alappin̲ alavākkāl, in the positive and negative conditional vin̲ai eccam respectively.

3. al² = evil, தீமை, as at Pal. 101a அல்லவை செய்ப.

4. al³ = poor, wretched, miserable, கல்வியறிவு இல்லாதாரின், as at Paḷ. 23a : அல் அவையுள் தோன்றி அல அலைத்து ...

5. an̲ukku = to cause distress, varuttu, C. here and M.L. (Madras Lexicon), p. 192. This unusual word, which does not occur in the Earliest Tamil Anthologies like the Kur̲un., occurs at Paḷ. 253c காம்பு அனுக்கும் மென்தோளாய்! = "O thou whose shoulders rival in softness, and thus

* The writer does not include Kalitogai as belonging to the earliest classics Kali. 80, 15 has "அம்புலி காட்டல் இனிது"

cause distress to, the bamboo reeds!" This word likewise occurs in the Early Mediaeval Kāvyas or Epic Poems, e.g., Peruṅkatai, I:53:154 அணிக்கவின் மென்னடை அனுக்க...... Cīvakacin. 1942a தீங்கரும்பு அனுக்கிய திருந்து தோள்களும். The Com. reads கரும்பைத் தம் அழகால் கெடுத்த தோள்கள்.

6. an̲aittu: This is one of the best words we possess in Tamil for gauging the relative time of any poem in this language. It corresponds to the Telugu word *anta,* which has two meanings:—

(A) *ṭhat, as much as, as far as, so much* e.g., gōr*anta* v'uṇṭe koṇḍ-*anta* cēstāḍu = he makes a mountain out of a molehill.

(B) *whole.* The final "a" is lengthened in talk: dēśam-*antā* = the whole land. These two meanings are to be found for the Tam. word an̲aittu: but in the earliest classics only the *first* meaning is found, in the later classics the second. Thus (A) at Kur̲un. 217:4 ஆங்கியான் கூறிய அனைத்திற்கு .... the Com. reads: அவ்வாறு யான் சொன்ன அதற்கு Cf. Kur̲un. p. 457. This is clearly the first meaning. This trisyllabic word "an̲aittu" has, as one should expect, a dissyllabic base already in the Kur̲un., as the following instances testify. "an̲ai" = so much, *avvaḷavu,* Com. as at Kur̲un. 99 : 6 அனைப்பெருங் காமம் ஈண்டு கடைக்கொளவே.

From this meaning it is just a step more in semantic change for "an̲ai" to obtain the connotation of "being like that", as at

Kur̲un. 315 : 3 ஞாயிறு அனையன் = my lover is like the sun.

„ 315 : 4 நெருஞ்சி அனையஎன் பெரும்பணைத் தோளே

„ 52 : 2 சூர் நசைத்து அனையை. 2nd Pers. sing. (spoken to a girl).

„ 164 : 6 அனையேம்= அத்தன்மையேம், C. 1st Pers. plural.

„ 309 : 6 நின்னூர் நெய்தல் அனையேம், பெரும.

In the whole of Kurun. you will *never* find this word in its second meaning.

B. But in the Paḷ. stanzas it is the *second* meaning that we come across :—

3a-b : விளக்குத் துளக்கமின்று என்று அனைத்தும் தூக்கி.
Com. விளக்கின் தன்மை முழுமையும் ஆராய்ந்து.

Likewise at Paḷ. 262 b ceykai anaittinum = in every action ; Com. ceykaiyinkaṇ *ellām*.

Paḷ. 277a : சீர்த்தகு மன்னர் சிறந்து அனைத்துங் கெட்ட.ாலும்.

The Com. reads : சீர்மை தக்க அரசர்களுடைய சிறப்பு எல்லாம் கெட்டவிடத்தும்.

Thus in the Paḷ. this word always means " whole, entire, all ". Contrast therewith its sense in Pura Nā. (A) or the first meaning is evident in these instances :

15 : 3 அனையவர் நனந்தலை நல்லெயில். C. அவருடைய = of *those*.

20 : 20 அனையையாகன் = C. அத்தன்மையை யாதலால் = since thou art of *that character*. Clearly the first meaning.

4 : 17 அனையை யாகன் = C. அத்தன்மையை யாதலான் = idem

196 : 8 அனைத்தாகியர் இனி இதுவே எனைத்தும்! C. அத்தன் மைத்து ஆகுக = may this now become *of that nature!* Optative.

Thus the Pur Nā., like the Kurun., has the word only in its first meaning : the Paḷ. employs it only in its second meaning. The Paripāṭal, which many literary critics state to be the last (in point of time) of the Eight Anthologies (எட்டுத் தொகை), has the word in both senses. Thus at

1 : 31 அன்ன மரபின் அனையோய் = thou art of *that* tradition.

3 : 44 அனைத்தும் அல்ல = C. அவ்வளவும் அல்ல = not so *much.*

In these instances we easily detect the first meaning. But at Paripāṭal 3 : 68 அனைத்தும் நீ; அனைத்தினுட் பொருளும் நீ = thou art *all* ! and thou art the reality in *everything !* This is the second meaning evidently, occurring twice in the same foot of this hymn in praise of Viṣṇu or Tirumāl. Thus we can safely state that the Paḷ. is slightly posterior to the Paripāṭal and is nearer to the time of the Paripāṭal than to that of the Kurun. or Pura Nā. from this and other instances.

7. ikal = battle, as twice in stanza 293 of Paḷ. a and b (first and second) lines :

இகலின் வலியாரை எள்ளி எளியார்
இகலின் எதிர்நிற்றல் ஏதம்.

The Com. on "ikal" is "pōr" = battle.

This noun is never seen in the Kurun. ; but the corresponding verb occurs once, at 257 : 6, in the sense of "opposing" : இகலுந்தோழிநங் காமத்துப் பகையே. The nominal form occurs at least twice in the Paripā., at 6 : 28 = a fight, at 9 : 36 = "pulavi" i.e. amatorial strifes between husband and wife ; in the almost contemporary work, Tiru Muruk. 131-2, in the sense of "enmity", in several other instances in the Paḷ. itself, as at 21b and 263b ; at Nāl. 137b ikal ilar ; at Patirr. 14 : 13 ikal koḷḷum ; 43 : 29 ikal vinai ; and at Tolkāp. Por. 68 : 9 ikal matil.

I have given a pretty *exhaustive* study of a few words, especially of "anaittu", above. Clearly it is impossible to continue this for the remaining 60 to 70 words, unless this article is to assume unmanageable proportions. Hence I shall mete out a more summary treatment to the remaining words.

8. avviyam = deceit, fraud, vañcakam, Paḷ. 264b. The words " avviyamum ceyvar " in this stanza are explained thus in the Com. " சூழ்ச்சி முதலியன செய்தலோடு பொய் உரைத்து வஞ்சித்தாயினும் "

The Kuraḷ, at 169a " avviya neñcattā<u>n</u> " has this word in its earlier meaning of perversity or envy. C. has மனக் கோட்டம், பொறாமை, அழுக்காறு. This word, as well as the opportunity for it, do not arise in the Karuntokai.

9. aḷ = small, ci<u>r</u>u, Paḷ. 297d. This is a peculiar meaning, not even mentioned in M.L. when it deals with this word on page 166. The words " aḷ illam " in our book are explained as " ci<u>r</u>iya illam " in the Com. on Paḷ. 297d.

10. ār = to obtain, aṭai, C. at Paḷ. 282d. The M.L. gives nine meanings for this word on page 239, but this sense is left out there. The proverb runs: எம் ஆரார் கோங்கேறினர். The Com. on this line, Paḷ. 282d, reads கோங்க மரத்தின் மீது ஏறினவர்கள் பாதுகாவலே அடையார்.

11. āṇṭu = there, Paḷ. 27b. This word is peculiar to the ancient classics and occurs seldom in later works. It occurs four times in the Ku<u>r</u>un., at 54 : 5 ; 184 : 4 ; 218 : 7 and 275 : 8 ; likewise at Pu<u>r</u>a Nā. 78 : 9 ; Paripā. 17 : 29 (twice) ; Muruk. 249 ; Ku<u>r</u>. 363b, 1098a ; Nāl. 35b, 91d, 271d ; Tolkā. Por. 562 ; 566 ; 571 ; 580 ; 634. The slightly later word to express this idea is āṅku = there, as at Ku<u>r</u>. 333b, 487a ; Nāl. 28c ; or āṅkan = there, as at Cīv. 1559c, and still later *aṅku* or aṅkē, with the radical or first syllable of āṅku *shortened*, as also for īṅku, ūṅku, yāṅku, *about* 700 A.D. But all the alternate forms are used for a long time later, at least occasionally.

12. āmā = wild cow, bos gaveus, kāṭṭuppacu, Com. M.L. p. 235. This word occurs at Paḷ. 282c and Nāl. 377a. An earlier form āmā<u>n</u>, in the identical sense, occurs at Ku<u>r</u>un. 322 : I ; Na<u>rr</u>. 165 : I ; Malaipaṭu. 500 ; Ku<u>r</u>iñc- 253 ; Cīv. 1902c, āmā<u>n</u> i<u>n</u>am. Thus while the earlier form

reaches out at least to the 9th century A.D., the later form, produced by the not unusual dropping of the final nasal, occurs at least as early as Pura Nā. 117 : 5 ஆமா நெடுநிரை.

13. iḷaitu = *that which is young, tender, weak, not fully developed,* as at Paḷ. 277d இளைது என்று பாம்பு இகழ் வார் இல்; so also at Paḷ. 286 a-b இளைது ஆய போழ்தே ... களையின், முதிராதே; at Kur. 879a இளைது ஆக முண்மரங் கொல்க... This word is not to be found in the Kurun., but the earlier and basic word "iḷai" = *weak, tender, young*, is frequently met with. Cf. Sinhalese "lamaya" = idem.

14. irai = king, Paḷ. 243b. The word irai occurs 13 times in the Kurun. but always in one of the following connotations: இறப்பு, கைச்சந்து, சந்து, சிறகு, சிறிது, தங்கு தல், முன்கை. It is never employed in the sense of king or ruler therein. In the Kuraḷ, however, irai is used in this sense, as at 547a இறைகாக்கும் வையகம் எல்லாம். Before this, at Tolkā. Por. 256a this word is employed in the sense of superior, uyarntōn, Com., and at Paripā. 11 : 8 in the sense of an elder brother. I suspect that this noun is intimately connected with the verb "irai", Kan. eragu = to bend, bow before, to worship. Cf. "iraiñcu", Kurun. 198 : 4; Tv. 1 : 21 (Tv = Tiruvācakam).

15. (uḷ <) uṇ = to take in, has 9 significations acc. to M.L., p. 402. But Paḷ. 297d employs the verb "uṇ" in the quite unusual sense of "*contracting*" *a debt,* which M.L. does not mention. The Com. reads koṇṭa kaṭanai.

16. "uṇṭi" (Nāl. Ia; 363c) and "uṇavu" (Pura. 18 : 20 and 21; Maṇi. 10 : 90) are the usual words for "food". The Kurun. employs "uṇṭi" alone, as at 156 : 4. The Paḷ. employs instead the alternate form "*uṇā*", as at 4d, 85d, 295d, as does Māṅkuṭi Kiḷār at Pura. 335 : 6. There is an ancient alternance between -avu and -ā as the final syllables of nouns, as is evident from such words as kaṉ-ā (Paḷ. 130d) and kaṉavu; purā and puravu, arā (Kurun. 43 : 4) and aravu (Kurun. 119 : 1), ira (= night, Kurun. twice) and iravu (= id. Kuruṇ. 10 times).

17. urai, acc. to M.L., has several senses: cf. p. 451 there. Here I take only one of the homonyms and trace its semantic changes:—

(1) urai, as a verb, "to speak, utter". 6 times in Kuṟun.; Paripā. 2 : 35; 18 : 22; Tolkā. Eḷ. 224d and Paḷ. 130c.

(2) urai, as a noun, "a speech, word". 3 times in Kuṟun.; Paripā. 2 : 35; Tol. Eḷ. 34b, 210g, 224c.

(3) urai, as a verb, "to speak harshly, to rebuke, scold," Paḷ. 75d and 295a.

(4) urai, as a noun, "a harsh word or reply", Paḷ. 75d, which is an old proverb: உரைத்தால் உரைபெறுதல் உண்டு.

18. uḷ = inside, is now employed as a locative postposition. But at Paḷ. 75b, "uḷ ūṉṟa", this word occurs in its ancient connotation as *a full-blooded noun.* The Com. reads மனம் உளையும்படி = to pain *the mind.* Cf. Kuṟun. 376 : 6 uḷ akam, and Nāl. 289c uḷ aṟṟu. The ordinary noun from this base, employed from Early Classical times to this day, is uḷḷam = the mind or the heart, as the seat of the emotions. Cf. Kuṟun. 102 : 1 உள்ளினும் உள்ளம் வேம். In the veṇpā stanza to Sarasvati, as the goddess of speech and wisdom, that starts with the words ஆய கலைகள் in the third foot (அடி) we come across the words என் உள்ளத்தின் உள்ளே. Herein "uḷḷam" is the noun, while "uḷḷē" is the locative casal affix or postposition. These two must be clearly distinguished.

19. eṇku = a bear, Paḷ. 292d, Maṇim. 16 : 68.

20. The particle "evaṉ", not in the modern sense of "who?" but in its old signification of "how?" Com. enṅaṉam, eppaṭi. The Kuṟun. employs this word in this sense or in the analogous sense of "what?" as often as 19 times, sometimes alone, sometimes with kol or ō, the particles of interrogation, added. The Kuṟ. too employs

the last two particles along with "evaṉ" in this sense. The Paḷ. at 282b does the same :

வா(ம்) மான் தேர் மன்னரைக் காய்வது எவன்கொலோ ?
How can one bear hatred towards kings with chariots and spirited steeds ?

This usage diminishes in early mediaeval literature onwards : there evaṉ = who ?

21. evvam = distress, tuṉpuṟutal, Paḷ. 267c ; Puṟa. 393 : 11 and Kuṟun. 289 : 2 (evva nōy) and five other times.

22. ētam = affliction, iṉṉal, Com. Paḷ. 293b. This word does not occur in the earliest stratum of Tamil, as in Kuṟun. and Puṟa Nā. which employ "evvam" instead. In the Kuṟaḷ, however, it occurs nine times, at 136b, 164b, 275b, 432b, 464b, 831a, 884b, 885b and 1006a. Likewise, at Maṇi. 5 : 71 ; 27 : 6 ; 29 : 48 ; at Cīv. 1097d, 2498d ; at Tiruvāc. 19 : 5 ; 20 : 20 ; 26 : 6 ; 30 : 22 ; at Tol. Por. 270 : 2 ; 458 : 1. Sometimes in the above mentioned instances the meaning changes to "fault", kuṟṟam ; "obstacle" iṭaiyūru. The employment of "ētam" puts Paḷ. in a later stratum of literature than Kuṟun. or Puṟa Nā. It seems absurd that the M.L. is unable to find even one instance from Tamil literature for this word on page 558 and feels obliged to cite lexicographers and nighaṇṭus like "Tivā". (Tivākaram) for the first two meanings of this word. On comparing "ētam" with "ēt - il" = faultless, at Tiruvāc. 43 : 31, one suspects "ētu" to be the real base and "-am" to be a cāriyai, as in several other words.

23. "ēm" = defence, shelter, protection, Paḷ. 282d. The Com. here gives "pātukāval". At times the word takes on the affix (cāriyai) "-am", and often the meaning changes to the "pleasure and delight", consequent on the protection afforded. The adjectival or correlative form is "ēma", as at Kuṟun. 107 : 7 ēma iṉ tuyil = the sheltered pleasant sleep beside her beloved one. In this sense "ēm"

or " ēmam " occurs 6 times in Kuṟun. ; at Puṟa. 1 : 11 ; Aka Nā. four times ; Patiṟṟ. 15 : 38 ; Ciṟupāṇ. 76 ; Maturaik. 686 ; Malaip. 306 ; Muruk. 97 ēm uṟa ; Cīv. five times at least ; Tol. Por. 37 : 1 ; 50 : 2 ; 72 : 8 ; 79 : 5 ; 111 : 34 ; 146 : 9 ; 147 : 19 ; 192 : 2.

24. " kaṭal ", in the M.L., page 660 and in Tamil literature generally, always means " the sea ". Such is its signification at Paḷ. 78c and d ; 269d etc. but at Paḷ. 197d it obtains the quite unusual connotation of " a far land over the ocean ". The pertinent words are : கடலுள்ளும் காண் பவே நன்கு. The Com. explains " kaṭal " here as கடல் தாண்டிச் சென்ற இடம்.

25. " kaṇ " has several senses, including " the eye ". In the early Tam. literature it also meant " a place ". Later, however, it ceased to be a noun *in this sense* and became a locative casal affix. Hence its occurrence as a *full-blooded noun in this sense* helps to fix the relevant work as to its time, as at Kuṟun. 355 : 1 ; 366 : 4 ; 379 : 3 ; 380 : 1 ; Aka. 8 : 9 etc., PN. 35 : 23 ; Nāl. 151a ; Kuṟ. 1058a and at Paḷ. 39a, 72a and c, 229a, 261c, 277c, 281c, 289a, c, 299d, atleast 10 times.

26. " kaṇakku ". The M.L., p. 701 gives it fifteen senses, of which I take the twelfth. When the classification of the earliest Tamil poetry took place, this was divided into two parts, with the word " kaṇakku " appended to both : mēṟkaṇakku and kīḻkkaṇakku. Here this word is not used in the modern sense of " reckoning " or " number ", but in the 6th to 7th century (A.D.) sense of *" literature "*. Now the Paḷ. employs the word in this very sense, in stanza 5 : கணக்கினை முற்றப் பகலும் முனியாது இனிதோதிக் கற்றல். Likewise at Paḷ. 92c kaṇakku means " letters ".

27. " kantu ". The M.L. on p. 719 gives 14 meanings to this word, both as noun and verb, of which 12 are nominal. The Kuṟaḷ at 507a, employs it to mean " a staff, crutch,

support": it is in this identical sense that Paḷ. too employs it, as at 292a பேதைமை கந்தா = அறியாமையைப் பற்றுக் கோடாக.

28. "Kalām". M.L. on p. 781 gives it four meanings, but all centred round the idea of "fighting in rage", as at Pur̲a Nā. 69 : 11, Maṇim. 1 : 63 ; Cīv. 620d (competition, mār̲upāṭu) ; also at Paḷ. 111a, 112b, 302c (fighting). But at Paḷ 78c it obtains an unusual connotation. The words are the following :—குடம்பை மடலொடு புட்கலாம். The Com. runs: கூடு ;பொருந்திய மடல்களோடு பறவைகள் விரவாநின்ற. Evidently புள் + கலாம் becomes புட்கலாம். But why "kalām ? This is the meaning, not of "kalām", which is a noun acc. to M.L., but of "kalāvu", the verb, acc. to M.L. and Kur̲iñcip. 48. Possibly kalāvum has been shortened into "kalām" owing to metrical exigencies. "Kuṭampai" (= a bird's nest) employed here is peculiar : it occurs also at Kur̲un. 301 : 2 and Kur̲aḷ 338a (nest with eggs), but is not the normal classical word for this. With kalāvum < kalām, compare vāvum < vām, under Nos. 20 and 70 here.

29. kan̲ar̲r̲u = to enrage, inflame, causative of "kan̲al, kan̲alu". The causative verb occurs at Pur̲a Nā. 384 : 12 in the physical sense of "heating up". Nāl. 291c has the simple verb "kan̲alumē", in the moral sense. Kalit. 148 : 13 and Paḷ. 295c employ the causative "kan̲ar̲r̲u" in the moral sense, applying it to the passions of carnal love and anger respectively.

30. katam = anger, Pur̲a Nā. 33 : 1 and Paḷ. 49c. In both instances this "anger" is attributed to dogs and the Com. renders it as "cin̲am". The *respective* words are these : kata nāy and katam paṭṭu nāy kavvin̲.

31. kātu = to overpower, Paḷ. 111d. This is a peculiar word, seldom met with in the early Tamil texts. It is employed here to describe the fatal results experienced by an untrained rider, who tries to mount and ride a mettle-

some steed and lashes it with his whip to bring it under his control. But he is thrown down headlong instead. The significant lines are :

நிலையழுங்க வேண்டிப் புடைத்தக்கால் வெண்மாத்
தலைகீழாக் காதி விடல்.

32. "kiḷaṅku". M.L. p. 935 equates this to "an esculent or bulbous root, as potato, yam, turnip, parsnip, palmyra root". It is in this sense that this word was used then and is employed now. Cf. Kuṟun. 379 : 2 ; Maṇi. 17 : 58 and the Com. on the former instance : கானவன் உண்ணும் பொருட்டுக்கிழங்கை அகழ்ந்தான். But at Paḷ. 296b கிழங்குடைய எல்லாம் முளைக்கும், the word reverts to its original sense of "anything going down (kīḻ)", any root ; வேருடைய புல் முதலியவெல்லாம் says the Com. With this one should compare "kiḻakku", which always connotes "below" *in the earliest texts,* never "east" as now. Some modern scholars, and even a Lecturer in Tamil at the University of London in my time, have not grasped this. Thus "kiḻakku" means "below", at Kuṟun. 337 : 2 ; Patiṟṟ. 36 : 10 ; Kuṟaḷ 448b ; Por. of Tolkā. 280.

33. "kuru", as a noun, is given 28 senses in M.L. on page 1013 : of these, the signification of "boil, sore, swelling" must be given to "kuru" at Paḷ. 283d கூன்மேல் எழுந்த குரு = "a boil on a hunch-back", a very graphic description indeed.

34. "kuṟu" means "short" and occurs about 60 times in the Kuṟun. in this sense, although M.L. on p. 1051 ignores this word. This word occurs often in Paḷ., especially in the picturesque proverb குறுமக்கள் காவு நடல், Paḷ. 120d. Small children uproot one another's trees and shrubs when planting a grove, as is my own experience 45 years ago.

35. From the above, kuṟu, was formed the verb kuṟai = to make short, thence to cut down, as at Paḷ. 280c (a

palmyra tree) ; 104c (the honey-flowing jack-fruit tree) ; 346d (the branch on which one is sitting) ; or to cut off (one's own hand, as the Pāṇḍiya King did), 76c.

36. kai = action. M. L. gives 28 meanings to "kai", on p. 1098 ; the nearest to our meaning that it gets to is No. 18, "that which is fit to be done". But at Paḷ. 109a, 242a, 248b, 280b, "kai" means "action", ceyal, Com. Kuṟun. has this usage nine times, Tol. Por. eleven times, Naṟṟ. and Aka. very often. Cf. Kan. key = to do and Tam. kai = the hand, the pre-eminent "do-er".

37. Koṭṭu = to clap, strike with the palms, Paḷ. 291d. An old word in Dravidian. Cf. koṭṭu in Tel. and Mal. in the identical sense.

38. Kommai. This word connotes at the same time circularity or rotundity, largeness and a slight elevation : it is therefore the aptest epithet for the swelling breasts of a young woman. This, as a matter of fact, is its most frequent use in Tamil literature from its earliest times, as at Kuṟun. 159 : 4 and AN. 65 : 18, both kommai vari mulai ; Paripā. 22 : 30 vār aṇi kommai ; Cīv. 347a kommai vem mulai ; Cīv. 236a and c,2790c. But the basic idea is *thick rotundity*, tiraṭci, C. as at Kuṟun. 281 : 2. Hence "kommai koṭṭal" came to denote the clapping of hands held in a conical manner, as at Paḷ. 291d கூற்றம் புறங்கொம்மை கொட்டுநர் இல் (= modern இல்லை) = none will clap his hands to Yama, the god of death. M. L. could have cited this instance instead of having to fall back on Tivā. as it does on p. 1155, No. 15. In later Tamil, according to the Dravidian o/u alternance, this word "kommai" becomes "kummi", in both Tam. and Mal. Cf. M.L. p. 1002 : 1.

39. "Kō nāy" = wolf, Paḷ. 292c. A very unusual word for the normal "ō nāy". M.L., which generally ignores the Paḷ. book, feels constrained to cite this instance from Pal. 292 : cf. its p. 1186.

40. cuvar = wall, Paḷ. 289c. This word occurs rarely in this sense in the early Tam. texts : the Kuṟun. has only one incidence, namely at 358 : 3. Aka. has two, 61 : 4 ; 289 : 10 ; Maṇi. at 21 : 125. "Cuvar" and "cuval" have near formations and near meanings : in E.C. texts the latter is used widely, far more frequently than "cuvar", as shown above.

41. talai aḷi = to regard with grace, protect and heap favours on, Paḷ. 289a. Likewise at Kuṟun. 397 : 6 ; 400 Colophon ; PN. 67 : 3.

42. tanicu = a debt, kaṭaṉ, C. Paḷ. 297d. This is a very uncommon word, with this meaning alone. Cf. M.L., p. 1816. The foot of Paḷ. cited here has three unusual words, which I discuss here under numbers 9, 15 and 42. The line is worth quoting : அள் இல்லத்து உண்ட தனிசு, al illattu uṇṭa tanicu. The Com. thereon reads : சிறிய வீட்டில் தம்மோடு வாழ்வார் மாட்டுக்கொண்ட கடன் = a debt contracted with persons living in the same small hut. Every time the creditors meet you, the debt is a source of mental distress : and in a small house they should meet you very often. A striking metaphor.

43. tārru = winnowing, sifting, koḷittal, Com., Paḷ. 16b, a very unusual word. M.L. gives both the verbal and the nominal forms of this word at the bottom of p. 1857, but is unable to give a single text as authority for either. Hence it sadly annotates Loc. (twice) and Yāḻ akarāti (once) : the Jaffna Lexicon is alluded to here.

44. tāṟu = id. acc. to the Com. on Paḷ. 69c tāṟṟappaṭṭatu. Cf. 43 above. M.L. on p. 1858 gives 9 significations for this word, but not the sense in Paḷ. 69c ; this is another instance of M.L. ignoring Paḷ.

45. "*tāyam*" first means a fall of the dice ; as this may be lucky or unlucky for any person who gambles therewith, the sense shifts to either a good opportunity, M.L. p. 1840, No. 8, or affliction, ibid. No. 9.

At *Paḷ*. 302d this last is the meaning : the time of old age and weakness.

46. tukir = coral, pavaḷam, *Paḷ*. 259d. A very old word, as the Kan. Tel. and Tul. equivalents testify. Cf. M.L. p. 1954. When we compare PN. 218:1 பொன்னுந் துகிரும் முத்தும் (tukirum) with Peruṇkatai, IV, 17:15 பவழமும் முத்தும் பசும்பொன் மாசையும் (pavaḷamum), we see that "tukir" has gone out of use in the later work and has been replaced by pavaḷam, later pavaḷam. Except for the (later) Panegyric on God, line 2 pavaḷa, Kuṟun. had no need to use either "tukir" or "pavaḷam", PN. (already cited) and Patiṟṟ. employ the former word alone, as at 30:7 of the latter work :— இலங்குநீர் முத்தமொடு வார்துகிர் எடுக்கும். Cilap. employs the former at 7:18 தூசுந் துகிரும் ஆரமும் அகிலும் tūcum *tukirum* āramum akilum ; but there are two references therein to pavaḷam and three to pavaḷam. The later words are gaining ground. Paripā. has forgotten "tukir", but employs "pavalam" at 19:87 and "pavaḷam" at 11:101. In the same boat are Maṇi. which employs "pavaḷam" once and "pavaḷam" eleven times and Cīv, which employs the former 13 times and the latter 9 times : there is no reference in either work to "tukir". "Ceteris paribus", i.e. other things being equal, we should therefore give an earlier date to Paḷ. 259 than to Perunk. Paripā. Maṇi or Cīv. on this ground alone. But conviction comes only by the study of a mass of words. On the other hand, it will be unwise to overload the canvas or overcrowd the painting. Hence I shall list below the words I have studied, but give the references generally from Pal. alone.

47. teṅku = the cocoanut, 34b, 216d (in both bases the fruit).

48. teruḷ = to become clear, later teḷi, C., 284b.

49. tēcu = a praiseworthy or glorious deed, 285b,
புகழிற்குக் காரணமாகிய செயல்,

50. nārāyam = a type of arrow, called "nārāyaṇam", Com. Pal. 50d.

51. paṭu = abundant, 247c (Com. mikunta), 251a (mikka nīr poruntiya).

52. payir [1] (noun) = a fault, kuṟṟam C., 259b.

53 payir [2] (verb) = to call (alaikkum, Com.), 260c.

54. pāṭu = (1) eminence, strength, perumai, 71d and at 303d valimai, Commentary.
(2) state, condition, takaimai, Com., 300a,b,c.

55. pāyiram = a promise of assistance for help rendered, 249c : *very unusual.*

56. pāru or pār = to spread rays, vīcu, Com. 229a. Cf. Nāl. 151a.

In this connexion must be noted the exact identity of the first five cīr (out of the 15 in any veṇpā stanza) in Nāl. 151a-b and Paḷ. 229a-b. Both run thus :—

அங்கண் விசும்பின் அகல்நிலாப் பாரிக்கும்
திங்களும் ....Fully one-third of the two stanzas from the two works is identical; clearly one is copied from the other.

57. puṭai = to beat, thrash, aṭi, 45c, 111c in the Paḷ. (unless otherwise noted).

58. pullam = a bull, āṉ ēṟu, 261c-d (twice).

59. pētaimai = ignorance, the folly of a simpleton, a very frequent word in Paḷ. (aṟiyāmai, Com.) at 267b, 187b, 292a. cf. pētai, at Paḷ. 93c.

60. "peyar", the verb "to separate", "to differentiate" is the origin of the noun peyar = "a name"; and

by an obvious semantic change it comes to mean "fame" as well. Both the noun and the verb remain "peyar" for nearly a thousand years of recorded Tamil literature, down to about 400 A.D. Thus in the Kuṟun. Aka. Puṟa. Kalit. Ṭol. (Eḷ. Col. and Por.) it remains always "peyar". Cf. Kuṟun. 83:2 ; AN. 67:9 ; Kalit. 17:21 ; Tol. Eḷ. 210h ; Col. 18a ; Por. 574 ; 603:1 ; 607:2 ; 613:2, for *the nouṉ* ; and Kuṟun. 309:4 and 9 other instances ; AN. 38:5 ; PN. 3:14 (twice) ; Kalit. 17:21 ; Tol. Por. 107:3 ; 111:28 ; 150:28 ; 169:1 ; 262:2 ; 301:2 ; 652:1 for *the verb*. At Cīv. 182c, however, we see the contracted form "pēr" = name ; and at Cīv. 1764b, we note the analogous verbal form "pērttu". The Kuṟal has the nominal form "peyar" four times and "pēr" four times. Paḷ. 189c and 239 have "pēr". This is significant. Nāl. 175b has "pēr" too : பேரும் பிறிதாகித் தீர்த்தமாம்.

61. "pai" = softness, freshness, greenness, 252c, 359c. At Nīti Neṟi Viḷakkam 61d and Fabricius Dictionary, p. 663, *green and lush vegetation* is termed "painkūḷ" and equated with "payir". We may suggest that "pai" and "pay-ir" are intimately connected in origin. The "-ir" suffix in the latter word is probably the old suffix of plurality that we find in such early Tamil words as kēḷ-ir = intimate friends ; puttēḷ-ir = gods ; peṇṭ-ir = women ; makaḷ-ir = girls ; vēḷ-ir = tribal chiefs ; putuv-ir = newcomers.

62. pol = to shine, be brilliant, splendid, good 31a (twice), 47a 119b. In early Tam. we find pol-am = the shining thing, gold, later poṉ.

63. pōṟṟu = to reflect, consider, 291b. This is a *peculiar* meaning : generally this verb means "to protect", Com. patu ko, as at Tolkā. 156f of Eḷ. ; Tol. Col. 115e, 462c (pōṟṟal vēṇṭum) ; Kuṟun. 275:6 ; PN. 217:4 ; Paripā. 4:52 ; 16:22 ; 20:72 ; Cīv. 338a 1720d. Another meaning of pōṟṟu is to praise, vāḷttu, C.

64. malai = to contradict, be in opposition, Com. māṟu-paṭu, Paḷ. 295b.

65. man̲ = 1. to stand firm, 119b, prob. the origin of man̲n̲an̲ = king.

= 2. to be abundant, 235b.

66. man̲r̲u = to punish severely, extirpate, uproot completely, 288d.

67. mā = 1. (as noun) riches, Com. celvam, 218b.

2. (as uriccol or adjective) splendid, great, Com. cir̲anta, 249a.

68. mān̲ = horse, 282b. In modern Tamil mān̲ = deer.

69. yāṇṭu = time, Com. kālam, Pal. 101d (twice). Now the word has become "āṇṭu", losing the initial "y": the meaning now is "a year".

70. vā (for vāvu) at 282b = to romp in, Com. tāviccellu. This line is quoted under No. 20.

71. viyaṅ koḷ = to receive an order from a king or other superior, Paḷ. 167a, 168b, 169b, 267a; likewise at Kur̲un. 114:3; Patir̲r̲. 54:15; Cilap. 9:78; etc. Tolkā. El. 210d. Col. 226c and Nan̲n̲ūl 145d turn the corresponding noun "viyaṅ kōḷ" into a grammatical term.

72. "vin̲ai" = deed, action, "vēlai" Com., at Paḷ. 77a, 274b, 350c. In modern Tam. this word too has gone out of use, except in philosophy and adage : தன்வினை தன்னைச் சூழும், or in grammar. So greatly is this word obsolete that in modern colloquial Tamil "vin̲aikkēṭu" has become "min̲akkēṭu", at least in the Jaffna Peninsula of Ceylon.

73. veḷḷam = a large number, 297a : likewise in Com. on Tolkā. 393 of Eḷ. Aiṅk 281a ; Patir̲r̲. 63 : 20.

74. vēli = *a knot,* kaṭṭu, 219d, *not a fence,* as normally.

75. "ār̲r̲u". This is a very favourite word in the Paḷ. It means :—

(a) to perform successfully, 1a, 223a.

(b) to progress very far (on the road to success), 1b, 4a, 287a, 291a. Here the vin̲ai eccam " ār̲r̲a " = very greatly, " mikavum ", Com.

(c) to bear the whole thing with equanimity, 47c, 222a.

According to a very ancient *alveolar/retroflex* (sounds) *alternance,* which I have detected in about 150 early Tamil words, Paḷ. employs not only the alveolar " ār̲r̲u " but also the retroflex " āḷ " and " āṭu " to mean " performing successfully ".

Thus Paḷ. 31c-d அறியும் பெரிது ஆள்பவனே பெரிது.

Thus Paḷ. 150c-d இளையோனே ஆயினும் மூத்தானே ஆடு மகன்.

In the first case, the Com. reads எல்லாவற்றையும் தன்வயமாக நடத்தும் அவனே; in the second instance ஆடுமகன் is explained as தொடங்கிய செயலைச் சோம்பலின்றி முடிப்பவன் ... அங்ஙனஞ் செயலை ஆற்றுவோன்.

I-B MORE IMPORTANT AND INSTRUCTIVE THAN THE INVESTIGATION OF SOLITARY WORDS IS THE STUDY OF PECULIAR PHRASES, SUCH AS :—

1. ām - āl - ō, Paḷ. 61a, Com. ākumō = could that be ?

2. iḷaittatu ikavā, Paḷ. 295c. Nāḷ. 6a has a quite similar phrase : இளைத்த நாள் எல்லை இகவா

3. iḻi taru, Paḷ. 258c = to descend. Both the word " iḻi " and its combination with the auxiliary verb " taru " are characteristic of the ancient texts, as testified by Kur̲un. (i.e. Kur̲untokai) 95 : 1 ; 134 : 6 ; 200 : 3 ; 284 : 7 ; 332 : 5 ; 339 : 3 ; Nar̲r̲. 347 : 7 (Nar̲r̲ = Nar̲r̲iṇai) ; AN. 138 : 8 ; 162 : 23 ; 282 : 10 ; 312 : 4 ; 322 : 9 ; Kur̲iñcip. 54.

4. poruḷ allār, Paḷ. 56b, 284a.

5. mun inna, Paḷ. 263d. If these words meant "very unpleasant", as they often mean in the classical work, Iniyavai Nārpatu, one of the 18 minor classics, i.e. if the word "mun" in this context had come to mean "mikuti" = much, very, as it came to signify in the 8th century A.D., then the Paḷ. itself would have to be dated in that century. But both the context and the Com. give this phrase in Paḷ. a different and earlier meaning. The relevant words are :— இகல்வேந்தன் தன்னை நலிந்து தனக்குறுதி கூறலால், முன் இன்னு மூத்தார்வாய்ச் சொல். The Com. too reads: முன்னே துன்பந் தரும், பின்னே மிக்க இன்பத்தை அளிக்கும், like learning acc. to N.N.V. 3a. May we not rather see in Paḷ. 263d the original phrase, which the later works, like Innā Nārpatu and Iniyavai Nārpatu have borrowed and modified in in meaning, just as Nāl. 294d (Nāl. = Nālaṭi) மானம் உடையார் மதிப்பு reappears fully at Iniyavai Nārp. 5d? The latter also reads: மானம் உடையார் மதிப்பு.

I-C STILL MORE IMPORTANT FOR OUR PURPOSE IS THE GRAMMATICAL PATTERN DISPLAYED BY THE PAL. WE TAKE A FEW INSTANCES :—

1. "*kaḷ*" *as the pluralising particle.* Tolkā. Col. 169 prescribes this for "ahriṇai" (Tam. neuter) nouns in these words :—kaḷḷotu civaṇum avviyal peyarē. At the same time Col. 7 ignores it in connexion with "uyartiṇai" nouns. On the other hand, Nannūl 278 prescribes "kaḷ" for both types of nouns. So do all later grammars. From this it is evident that it was only gradually that this pluralising particle spread from the neuter to the other type of nouns. In fact, in the earliest texts it is not employed even for the neuter nouns: the plural of nouns is sensed from the context, or from the form of the verb or predicate, or by the use of other particles, like "ir". We note that *on the whole* the Pal. follows the earlier pattern, as at 7d பாம்பு அறியும் பாம்பின கால் = snakes (neuter in Tamil) alone recognise the legs of (other) snakes. Here not once is the pluralising particle "kaḷ" employed. Likewise at 78c puḷ = birds, C. பறவைகள். There are cases, however,

where the Paḷ. employs this particle, as at 197a karumaṅ-kaḷ = actions, Com. ceyalkaḷ, a neuter noun, and even for uyartiṇai nouns, at least *once,* namely piḷḷaikal = children, at 264c. But it may be claimed that in several languages, where "men" are masculine, "child" is neuter, as in German, which employs "der Mann" but "das Kind". It was only in the Tam. Kāvyas of the 6th to 9th centuries A.D. that "kaḷ" began to be employed on a large scale for uyartiṇai nouns too, as "yāṅkaḷ" at Cilap. 11 : 171 ; Cīv. 1793b.

2. "ēl" for "āyil". In several languages (a or) ā+i = ē. Thus in Sanskrit mahā + indra = mahēndra etc. In Tam. too we notice the same phenomenon. Thus at Paḷ. 11b eṟṟ – ēl = ettaṉmaittu āyil, Com. = of what type, it may be i.e. were I to state it. This was the origin of those *prohibitions* learnt by Tamilian children, like iyalvatu karav-ēl, īvatu vilakkēl, which were at first conditional clauses, followed by naṉṟu = "it would be good" in word, intonation or gesture. The second maxim here quoted meant at first : "if you do not prevent others from doing charity, that would be good". Next it came to mean : "do not prevent others from doing charity". This development into the Neg. Imperative of "ēl" is later than its employ-ment as a "conditional particle", as it is used in Paḷ. e.g. 11b.

3. āyiṉāl = accordingly, at Paḷ. 4c : this is a peculiar usage.

4. āyiṉum < ēṉum, exactly as āyil < ēl, in 2 above. We come across āyiṉum at Paḷ. 37c, 75c, 177c, 245c, and ēṉum, ibidem, 85a. Still another peculiar formation, employed in the same sense, is "āṉum", explained as "āyiṉum" in the Com. at Paḷ. 11a, i.e. in the line previous to the one cited in 2 above : கற்றானும் கற்றார்வாய்க் கேட்டா னும் இல்லாதார்.

5. āy > ai. Readers of Telugu are familiar with the phenomenon that where Tam. employs the particle "āy",

Tel. employs "ai" *. A similar alternance obtains between Mod. Tam. and Old Tam. Thus Kuṟun. 342 : 7 paṇpiṉai (O. Tam.) = iyalputaiy – āy, Com. (Mod. Tam.) ; Puṟa Nā. 46 : 2 marukaṉ-ai (O. Tam.) = marapil uḷḷ-āy (Com. Mod. Tam.).

Consider this line :—

நெடியது காண்கிலாய்; நீ எளியை, நெஞ்சே!

Thus at Paḷ. 46a, we find both forms, *side by side,* in the same line, as above.

6. The suffix "īka" at Pal. 245c is quite peculiar. These are the relevant words :— கொல்தலையே ஆயினும் கொண்டீக. The Com. renders the last word "koṇṭ-īka" as "koḷka" = "take", as the polite imperative, sometimes termed the Tam. optative, which generally employs the particle "-ā" to form this mood. The unexplained part of this word is therefore the middle, "īku". Fortunately we possess at Aka. Nā. 124 : 3 this very particle :— சென்றீகென்ப. The Com. explains ceṉrīka as ceṉru aruḷka, thus equating "īka" to "aruḷka" = bestow, grant. But in actual fact, the auxiliary verb "īka", suffixed to the main verb "ceṉru", has lost its *full* significance of "bestowing", or granting, in the AN. instance. In the Pal. instance cited above and at Kuṟaḷ 1268a veṉrīka vēntan = let the king win victories, "īka" has lost this signification *absolutely.* This is significant for the age of the three works concerned, namely Aka Nā (AN.), Kuṟaḷ and Palamoli.

7. The negative imperative ending in "-al" is the origin of (and therefore much earlier than) the optative (2nd pers.) which ends in "-aṟka" (= al + ku + a). It is the latter form that we meet with constantly in Paḷ., as at 64b moḻiyaṟka ; at 273b uraiyaṟka. These words mean : do not say ; do not utter.

---

* Tel. aina = Tam. āyina ; Tel. -ayinavi = Tam. -āyinavai.

8. ṭum, as the suffix of the 1st Pers. pl. of the Present tense, as at Paḷ. 229b kāṇṭum = kāṇkin̲r̲ōm = we see. The first line of this stanza is in IA, 56.

9. ṭum, as the suffix of the 1st pers. pl. of the *Indefinite* tense, as ar̲itum, Paḷ. 74b = we come to know; vēṇṭutum, Paḷ. 273b = we desired and desire. Cf. āṭutum, Nāl. 332b; verūutum, Kalit. 17 : 2 = we shall bathe; we fear, respectively.

10. "kir̲p"—This is a very ancient cāriyai, found already at Kur̲un. 22 : 2 pirikir̲p-avar = piripavar, Com.; at Kalit. 39 : 38 paṭar-kir̲p-īr = naṭappīr, Com.; at Kalit. 39 : 40 karak-kir̲p-en̲ = mar̲aippēn, Com. This particle is found likewise at Pal. 218b potikir̲pār = karattalaicceyvār = they will hide, and at Pal. 294a ven̲r̲u aṭukir̲pārai = tammaikkolla vallavarkaḷai = those capable of overpowering and oppressing them. From the above instances it is clear that this particle denotes the further-aorist tense in ancient Tamil. Slightly later in time we come across the analogous particle, "-kir̲k", as at Nāl. 62d muṭi-kir̲k-um, 352d tēr-kir̲k-um.

11. Intimately connected with "-kir̲p"- is the particle "pu", which *in Old Tam.* converted the verbal root into the vin̲ai eccam of the past tense, in preference to the Mod. Tam. particle "tu". The forms modelled on "ceypū" are more frequently employed than those modelled on "ceytū" or "ceykū" and cover more than half the instances of the past absolutive or vin̲ai eccam in the Eight Anthologies. Therefrom was formed the 3rd Pers. pl. aorist, modelled on "ceypa", according to Tolkā. Col. 206, which prescribes the personal affixes:

"அர் ஆர் பஎன வரூஉம் மூன்றும்
பல்லோர் மருங்கிற் படர்க்கைச் சொல்லே."

This then is the origin of the particle "pa" in such words as the following:—

(a) eṉpa, Kuṟun. 39 : 3 ; 74 : 5 ; 76 : 2 ; 87 : 2 ; 136 : 1 ; 204 : 1 ; 213 : 6 ; 228 : 4 ; 246 : 4 ; Aka Nā. 36 : 12 ; 76 : 6 ; 96 : 10 ; 116 : 10 ; 124 : 3 ; 186 : 14 ; 195 : 5 ; 216 : 6 ; 246 : 7 ; 266 : 9 ; 336 : 12 ; Puṟa Nā. 71 : 3 ; Aiṅk. 67 : 3 ; 152 : 4 ; 369 : 3 ; 467 : 4 ; Kalit. 46 : 19.

Tolkā. El. employs " eṉpa in its text 18 times ;
" Col. " " " 35 " ;
" Por. " " " 85 " ;
the Kuṟaḷ 24 times. Nāl, however, has " eṉpa " only once, at 250c and employs the later form " eṉpar " instead, at 282a. It employs " kaṟpa " at 135c = they learn or study.

(b) molipa = they say, 20 times in the Kuṟun. ; at Naṟṟ. 290 : 9 etc., Aka Nā. 216 : 6 etc. ; at Tolkā. El. 20 times, Col. 7 times, Por. 57 times.

(c) On a minor scale this usage persisted even to the time of the Naṉṉūl, which has " nērpa " at 386d. We now note that this ancient usage is pretty common — in Paḷ. as

(d) kāṇpa, at 197d = kāṇpārkaḷ, Com = they will see.

(e) Ceypa, at 249c = ceyyum, Com. = they will do.

(f) pōḷpa, at 8d = piḷappar, Com. = men will split, cleave.

(g) māṟupa, at 77c = viṭṭu nīṅkuvārkaḷ = they will desert it. But it is not so widespread in Paḷ. as in Kuṟun. AN and Tol.

12. " -miṉ ". It occurs at Paḷ. 108b ceymmiṉ = ceyyuṅkaḷ, C = do ye. This particle and its origin have been the subject of controversy. According to Tolkā. Col. 224, Naṉṉul 145c and 337, this " miṉ " is an affix denoting the 2nd Pers. pl. impv. But it seems more scientific to regard this as the wedging together of the two particles " um " and " iṉ ". Let us first take the former particle " um ". Compare īṉ-ummō at Puṟa Nā. 130 : 2 with īṉ-marō at Puṟa Nā. 74 : 7 ; eṉ-um, at Tol. Eḷ. 25a, 61a, 62b, 73, 322b,

352 and eṉṉumō at Naṟṟ. 176 : 4 with eṉmō at Kuṟun. 392 : 6 ; pōl-um at Kuṟun. 222 : 4 ; 389 : 5 etc. with pōṉm, Aka Nā. 248 : 9 ; 332 : 15 ; Puṟa Nā. 19 : 6 ; uṟaiyunar at Kuṟun. 65 : 4 with uṟainar at Kuṟun. 145 : 4 ; Aka Nā. 67 : 18 ; puṇar-um-ār at Naṟṟ. 304 : 5 with puṇarmār at Neṭunal. 67 ; Paripā. 11 : 67. In each of the pairs compared, both words have the identical meaning. In the first, however, there is the particle "um" : this is *replaced* in the second by "m". This is known as the syncope of "um" into "m" and appears in more than a thousand instances in the Eight Anthologies and in Tolkā. in such words as eṉmaṉār, Eḷ. 6b etc. ; ceymmaṉ, Eḷ. 210c ; Col. 222c ; Puṟa Nā. 150 : 13 ; ceymmē, PN. 46 : 8 ; kēṇmō, Cīv. 1597a ; koṇmō ; Kuṟun. 114 : 3 ; Aiṅk, 78 : 4 ; Ceṉmē, Naṟṟ. 395 : 10 ; AN. 176 : 26 ; 396 : 19 ; PN. 133 : 7 ; ceṉmō, Kuṟun. 238 : 5 ; 275 : 2 ; Naṟṟ. 358 : 7 ; 365 : 5 ; AN. 32 : 17 ; PN. 381 : 5 ; the above words are from eṉ, cey, kēḷ, koḷ, cel, respectively. *Nillum - ē < niṉmē, Naṟṟ, 300 : 12 ; *nō-um < nōm, Kuṟun. 4 : 1, 4 ; puraimē, Kalit. 54 : 20 ; muṭimē, Col. 433, 438, 270b from muṭiyumē ; similarly moḷimē, Kuṟun. 51 : 6 ; moḷimō, Kuṟun. 2 : 2 ; and *varumō < *varmō < *vammō,* by assimilation, PN. 180 : 9 ; 221 : 10 ; 281 : 7. The same word occurs at AN. 312 : 8 ; 323 : 7 and elsewhere. Now a comparison of this word with *vammiṉ,* kalit. 104 : 63 ; Cīv. 2988c ; and of koṇm-ō above with koṇm-iṉ, Poruḷ. of Tolkā. 425 : 2, would readily suggest the identity of the verbal base in each instance. Hence the existence of the syncope is assured. We must regard "um" as the affix, which, like "ir" and "īr", denotes the 2nd Pers. pl. impv. The "iṉ", which is wedged thereto, is the old particle, which connotes "now", "at once", as at Kuṟun. 287 : 2 ; Mullaip. 16 ; Neṭunal. 155 ; Nāl. 55a, 29b (twice) ; in each instance the Com. explains "iṉ" as "ippoḷutu" = just now.

A close study of Nāl. 6c "vaḷaṅkumiṉ" (contrast "nāḷai" = tomorrow) and of Nāl. 7c "ākumiṉ" ; 36c "oruvumiṉ" ; 36d "maruvumiṉ" will confirm this view.

With the fusion of the Tam. particle, " iṉ " meaning " now " with the previous imperative, *compare* the fusion of the Hebrew word " na " = " now " with the previous imperative, " hoshea " = save (us). The two words were soon wedged together into " Hosheana ", at first a joyful prayer, then a jubilant shout, like the Saivite " Harōharā ". In the Vulgate, the Hebrew word was transformed into " Hōsanna ", the form in which it is most familiar to the European and Asian. Coming to a language closer to Tamil than Hebrew, namely, Telugu, we note the fusion of the honorific affix, aṇḍi = sir, to the impv. e.g. koṭṭ-aṇḍi = strike. In the instance cited above from Paḷ. 108b, namely " ceymmiṉ ", we note also the doubling of " m " as compensation for the syncope of " ceyum " (= do ye) into " ceym ". The fact that in Tamil writing the consonant and the following vowel are written as one letter, e.g.   not as two letters, as in English e.g. " mi ", facilitates the wrong or false divisions that later grammarians made, such as " miṉ, mō, mati, mār ". In each of these cases, " m " goes with the previous syllable, resulting in the particles : " iṉ, ō, ati, ār respectively. The incidence of this " iṉ " in the manner aforesaid is most frequent in the early Tamil texts down to about 900 A.D.

II. THE INTERNAL EVIDENCE OF CERTAIN STANZAS : PERSONS MENTIONED.

1. Pāri and Pēkaṉ. At Puṟa Nā. 158 Peruñcittiraṉār eulogizes " the Seven " Vaḷḷals or paragons of generosity indirectly and Kumaṇaṉ directly : at line 17 எழுவர் மாய்ந்த பின்றை he shows clearly that Kumaṇaṉ lived shortly after " the Seven ", including பறம்பிற் கோமான் பாரி (l. 4) and பெருங்கல் நாடன் பேகன் (l. 12). The reader should read the whole poem. At Paḷ. 74, however, its author speaks of these two " Vaḷḷal " as having lived generations earlier and of his having come to hear of their generous deeds through ear-borne tradition : this is very significant for our purpose.

'முல்லைக்குத் தேரும் மயிலுக்குப் போர்வையும்
தொல்லை அளித்தாரைக் கேட்டறிதும்.'

Compare the commentary : முன்னுளில் கொடுத்தவர்களைக் கேள்வி வாயிலாக அறிந்தோம் ...... முல்லைக்குத்தேரீந்தான் பாரி. மயிலுக்குப் போர்வையீந்தான் பேகன். Pāri donated a chariot to the wind-tossed jasmine shrub as a support : Pēkan donated his cloak to the peacock shivering in the cold. Not alone this : but in the course of generations, while their gesture of heroism has been praised by all, a certain element of a simpleton's quality, akin to folly, therein has come to be criticised by the learned, including this author. None the less, in the truly great, like these two "Vaḷḷals", such an extreme simplicity (ari maṭam) tends only to magnify their greatness, perhaps as a foil set behind a gem : அறிமடமும் சான்ருேர்க்கு அணி. This is the proverb proper.

2. The Cōḷa king, Karikālan, is mentioned more frequently than any other potentate in our Book of Proverbs. At 6a-c, his memorable judgment, like that of the Jewish king, Shalomon, is eulogised with considerable pride by the poet :— ....இளமையோன் என்ற நரைமுது மக்கள் உவப்ப—நரை முடித்துச் சொல்லால் முறைசெய்தான் சோழன்... This young king agreeably surprised his aged ministers not only by his gray wig and solemn demeanour but also by his solid judgment, coupled with a keen discernment into the merits of the case from the words alone of the contending litigants.

Therefrom the poet draws the inevitable conclusion, which is the proverb proper in this instance : குலவிச்சை கல்லாமல் பாகம்படும். Here "vidyā" in Sk. has through Pāli and Prākrit become Tam. "viccai". "The cleverness peculiar to a family will be found in its members without even a preliminary training" : here the author alludes to the centuries-old Cōḷa dynasty that preceded Karikālan and the peculiar circumstances under which the latter mounted this throne after years of exile or imprisonment

from his childhood days. This is not the only reference to this king in our work, the Paḷamoḷi. At 230a-b, the poet recalls another anecdote about the same king, just before his ascending the throne, and relates how the royal elephant, released from its pen or enclosure at Cīkāḷi or Kaḷumalam, picked him out and brought him from Karuvūr in the Cēra country to be crowned king of the Cōḷas and thus to replace his wicked paternal uncle :—

> ' கழுமலத்தில் யாத்த களிறும் கருவூர்
> விழுமியோன் மேற்சென்றதனால்......'

A still earlier anecdote is mentioned at 239a-c. The poet alludes to the childhood of Karikālan̲, son of Parāntaka, to his leg " being singed " at the hands of the usurper, to his escape from the burning home owing to the help of his maternal uncle, the poet, Irum Piṭarttalai, and his regaining his sceptre with the poet's assistance ; the author of Paḷ. seems to be an ardent admirer of this earlier poet and still more of that poet's nephew, Karikālan̲ :

> 'சுடப்பட்டு உயிர்உய்ந்த சோழன் மகனும்
> பிடர்த்தலைப் பேராணைப் பெற்றுக்—
> கடைக்கால் செயிர்அறு செங்கோல் செலீஇயினான்...'

The rest of this article will form its Part 2 in the next year's issue.

CONCLUSION

I shall conclude with the following succinct remarks :

(1) The edition of the Paḷamoḷi (Paḷ.) that I have used here is the first edition (Nov. 1948), published by the South India Saiva Siddhanta Society, கழக வெளியீடு 475, மூலமும் உரையும்.

(2) The system of transliteration and signs is that utilised by the Madras Lexicon (M.L.), Vol. VI, *Appendix*, page 68, except that I use *h* instead of *k* to express the Tamil āytam.

(3) The abbreviations I employ are either those employed by the M.L. Vol. VI, *Appendix,* pages 61-63, 69-96, or those that I have explained in the course of my dissertation, like AN. for Aka Nā., PN. or Pu<u>r</u>a. for Pu<u>r</u>a Nā. etc., except for ibidem = " in the same work ".

(4) Any one who has carefully read through *Tamil Culture,* Vol. VII, No. 4, page 336, must have been struck by the citation at the bottom of that page, starting with the words வெந்திறல் கடுவளி. It has *nothing* to do with the subject under discussion, which is Nālaṭi, stanza 39. In fact, the printer begins his citation with *its* first line in English transliteration. Then suddenly he brings in stanza 39 of the Ku<u>r</u>un. complete, in Tamil, possibly because the article in question is about the Ku<u>r</u>untokai anthology. On the next page, at the top, he gives the remaining three lines of Nāl. 39, likewise in English transliteration. To forestall such mistakes on the part of the printer, I have, in my present article, given the general meaning of a verse in English but written out the line, verse or stanza in Tamil, sometimes additionally in English.

(5) The Ku<u>r</u>un., Paripā., Maṇi (mekalai), Cīv (akacintāmaṇi) and to some extent PN. are the only classics so far edited somewhat critically by native Tamil scholars; the Ku<u>r</u>aḷ, Nāl (aṭi) and Tiruvāc (akam) by European ones. *The edition of Paḷ. that I use has no index whatever.* In the remaining works the index, where there is one, is woefully inadequate. Only the more difficult words are given therein. Even here, the *page* alone is cited, *not the line.* As a page consists mostly of 42 lines and each line of 8 to 9 words, there is considerable loss of time and unnecessary hardship in tracing out any word therein. There is a further complication. Even Dr. U. V. Sāmināthaiyar *does not,* in his index to his editions, *distinguish between the word and its meaning.* In his index to the Ku<u>r</u>un. and in that to the PN. he has listed 4 and 17 words respectively with " ca-" as the initial syllable and attri-

buted 6 incidences to the former work and 47 incidences to the latter. After a minute investigation of every one of these 53 instances, sometimes through many lines of the poem concerned, often through all, I found that the vast majority of these references are not to the word in question but to other Tamil words *with that meaning.* At the end I obtained a much shorter list, wherein Kuṟun. had only one word, "cakaṭam", which occurred only once; PN. had only three words, with a total of 12 references to such words *in the actual text.* The remaining 40 were *references to the Commeṉtaries* (C or Com.). *All my references* to Paḷ. and to the other works *are to the actual texts,* unless I expressly state otherwise. Such a research is dry indeed; I have accordingly tried to make its results palatable by adopting a golden mean between excess and defect. Thus for instance, I have before me every single reference to "eṉpa" and "moḻipa" in Tol(kāppiyam); as they would cover two to three pages, I have given only the total number of such references in its El(uttu), Col, and Poruḷ. So for the rest.

One Hundred Years of Dravidian Comparative Philology

KAMIL ZVELEBIL

It is now just one hundred years since the unique work, called "*A Comparative Grammar of the Dravidian or South Indian Family of Languages*" was published by Bishop *Robert Caldwell* in 1856.[1] By this outstanding work he created a new branch of Oriental philology, the comparative philology of the Dravidian languages. Now, after a hundred years, notwithstanding the fact that, in comparison to other branches of Oriental linguistics (e.g. classical Indology or Semitistics), the Dravidian philology is "still in its infancy",[2] its evolution, nevertheless, has reached such forms and such significance that it is necessary to consider the past developments and to reflect on its future.

1

The time before Caldwell may be characterized as the period of pioneer work. It is important to notice that the Europeans got acquainted with Tamil sooner than with Sanskrit; that fact is, however, natural, since Tamil was a living language and also because the Portuguese came to South India sooner than the other colonisers to Northern India. It is, however, equally important that the newcomers started soon to cultivate their practical knowledge of Tamil, the main and the most cultured representative of the Dravidian languages, and to dedicate their attention to this language also from the philological point of view.

---

1 R. Caldwell, *A Comparative Grammar of the Dravidian or South-Indian Family of Languages*, London 1856, 2nd ed. 1875, 3rd ed. 1913.

2 Cf. *Note on Dravidian Morphology* in Acta Orientalia XX by F. B. J. Kuiper, p. 252.

If we overlook, on the whole, at the prehistory of these interests which was characterized by the first books printed in Tamil in the years 1577 [3] and 1579 (by Father *Anrique Anriquez*, a member of the Jesuit order),[4] we must, however, consider the year 1672 as an outstanding year, because, at the time, *Philip Baldaeus* published a brief Tamil grammar in his " Truthful and Detailed Description of the Celebrated East Indian Coasts of Malabar and Coromandel " in Amsterdam.[5] This work is followed by several others, written by various Catholic missionaries : the first dictionary of Tamil and Portuguese (by *Antem da Proenca* in 1679), a further grammar by *Baltazar da Costa* (1680), and, finally, the most significant work from the pen of a Protestant missionary, *Bartholomaeus Ziegenbalg*, " *Grammatica Damulica* ", Halae Saxonum, 1716.[6] This is also the first Tamil book printed in Europe. To this period belong also the unique works of the greatest of these pioneers, *Constant Joseph Beschi S.J.*, who knew Tamil to such a point of perfection that he wrote-apart from other works (as an epic masterpiece called *Tēmpāvaṇi*) -still perhaps the best grammar of High Tamil, based on a profound knowledge of the then accessible texts and of native Tamil grammars.[7]

---

3 Cf. M. C. Venkatacami, *Kiristavamum Tamilum*, Madras 1938, p. 24 : " *inta nulukku kiristuva vetopatecam* (Flos Sanctorum) *enpatu peyar.* " Also Tamil Lexicon, I, p. XXXV f.

4 *Doctrina Christiana* (*Kiristava Vanakkam*), a maneira de dialogo, feita em Portugal pello P. Mascos Jorge, da Companhia da Jesu : Transladada èm lingua Malavar ou Tamul pello P. Anrique Anriquez. Cochin 1579.

5 Philip Baldaeus, *Naauwkeurige Beschryvinge van Malabar en Choromandel*, ... Amsterdam 1672. *Malabarsche Spraak-konst*. Cf. Buitenen—Ganeshsundaram, A 17th Century Dutch Grammar of Tamil, BDCRI, 14. 3. pp. 168—182.

6 B. Ziegenbalg, *Grammatica Damulica* quae per varia paradigmata, rēgulas & necessarium vocabulorum apparatum, viam brevissimam monstrat, qua Lingua Damulica seu Malabarica, quae inter Indos orientalés in usu est, hucusque in Europa incognita fuit, facille disci possit. Halae Saxonum, Literis & impensis Orphanostropei MDCCXVI.

7 Cf. especially the following works of Father Béschi :

(1) *Clavis humaniorum litterarum sublimioris Tamulici idiomatis*, Ms. cca 1730, ed, Tranquebar 1876.

Among the first, who worked on the Tamil language, we have found also a Czech, *Carolus Przikryl* of the Society of Jesuits, in whose works the great Czech linguist *Dobrovsky* has taken a large interest. Przikryl lived in India from 1748 till 1762. *Dr. P. Poucha* from the Oriental Institute, Prague, found in Przikryl's manuscript of Konkani grammar also several pages of unfinished Tamil grammar. The roots of Czech Tamilian studies thus ranged up to the middle of the eighteenth century.[8]

Should we reflect over these first scholars and should we consider when Europe became acquainted with the Dravidian languages and with old Tamil literature, we are justified in asking in astonishment what were the motives which resulted afterwards in the Dravidian languages being neglected for such a long time on the verge of linguistic science and why even the most professed Indologists have not shown interest in them.

Apart from the interior blocking factor, which is due to the fact that the Dravidian languages are not easy, that four of them have vast, rich and ancient literatures whereas the others are languages spoken by " primitives " and badly reported, there are also further causes for this indifference, more objective and of various external reasons :

1. It was assumed that the Sanskrit-speaking invaders of Northwest India were people of a high and virile culture who found in India only culturally feeble barbarians. At

(2) *Grammatica Latino-Tamulica* ubi de elegantiori linguae Tamulicae dialecto centamil dicta, cui adduntur Tamulicae poeseos rudiments ad usum missionarium Societatis Jesu, Ms. cca 1730. Ed. Trichinopoly 1917. Engl. translation 1882.

(3) *A Grammar of the Common Dialect of the Tamul Language.* Transl. by G. W. Mahon, Madras 1848. Latin orig. Tranquebar 1728.

8 The fragment comprises a list of Tamil characters, pronunciation (unfinished), and a paragraph on the declination of nouns. It is based most probably upon the study of some older Tamil grammar, probably that of Beschi. C. Przikryl S.J., born in Bohemia 1718, in Goa from 1748—9 to 1762, died in Bohemia 1785. Cf. also K. Zvelebil, *A Czech Missionary of the 18th Century as Author of a Tamil Grammar*, Tamil Culture, IV, 4, October 1955.

that time, without the benefit of spectacular archaeological discoveries and other, e.g. epigraphic, sources, the earliest speakers of the Indo-Aryan languages were described as classical Greeks or Romans, prosperous bearers of a high civilization. In fact they were nomadic and barbarous looters and cattle-reivers, disrupting older civilizations and, on the other hand, being civilized by them.

2. The other cause of this deplorable attitude to the old inhabitants of India was the "romantic" strand which led to Sanskrit being regarded as, to use Mayrhofer's phrase, "die ur-ste aller Ur-sprachen"; in short, the Indo-European savages were the noblest of all savages.

3. This assumption led to the methodological tendency to find Indo-European etymologies for the greatest possible portion of the vocabularies of the Indo-European languages. The suggestion that the noble, not to say divine, Sanskrit, an example of purity and integrity could have some borrowings from Dravidian was unthinkable. In spite of this, we know now about five hundred important borrowings from Dravidian into Sanskrit, more or less securely proven, among them even several words from the Rigveda.[9]

Nowadays, the aspects are different, the general conception of Indian linguistics changes. On account of these changes, also, the Dravidian comparative philology has achieved important results. Now to return to the history of our branch of linguistic science.

I shall not expound upon every work and every scholar in the study of the Dravidian languages from the time before Caldwell. I want only to sketch a short characteristic of this work, of its meaning and importance for the future investigator. It is the work, done mostly under difficult conditions by Catholic and Protestant missionaries,

---

[9] This passage according to M. B. Emeneau, *Linguistic Pre-history of India*, Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society, 98-4, pp. 282-92.

especially these of the Society of Jesuits and also of Danish, German and Swedish missions. And to them our thanks are due.

In the first half of the 19th Century there were published several dictionaries, more grammars, important first editions of texts and translations from old literature of the great Dravidian languages, the first smaller monographic studies in magazines ; [10] and, at the same time, there began to be seen a slight interest in the so called non literary Dravidian languages.[11] The chief merit of Tamil studies of that time is due to *Johann Philip Fabricius* (in 1799 he published the outstanding "Tranquebar Dictionary"), *Charles Theofil Edward Rhenius* and *Dr. Graul.*[12] Graul had published an excellent grammar and in 1856, just a hundred years ago, the first great translation from Tamil into a European language was printed in Leipzig, Graul's German translation of the famous *Tirukkuraḷ*.

Graul also intended to found a *Bibliotheca Tamulica* in Germany, but his premature death prevented him to realize his ambition.

---

10 Cf. the bibliography in J. Vinson, *Manuel de la Langue Tamoule*, Paris, 1903, p. 231 ff.

11 Frye's grammar of Kui in 1851, Letchmajee's *Introduction to Kui* in 1853, Leech's *Epitome of the Grammar of Brahui* in 1838, Lassens's article about Brahui in 1844, Elliott's and Manger's articles about Gond in 1847, a short grammar of Gond by Driberg and Harrison in 1849 etc.. The bibliography in this and the following foot-notes is far from being exhaustive. It gives only the more important, or very characteristic works for the respective epoch or problem. A complete bibliography see in Linguistic Survey of India, IV, Calcutta, 1906. Cf. also Constantin *Rögamey*, Bibliographie analytique des travaux relatifs aux elements anaryens dans la civilisation et des langues de l'Inde ; *Bull. de L'Ecole* Francaise d'Extreme Orient, XXXIV, 2, 1935, pp. 429—566.

12 Johann Philip Fabricius, *A Malabar and English Dictionary*, Tranquebar, 1799, reprinted in 1809 etc. Best edition of the Tamil Grammar by Rhenius is the fourth Madras 1888. Karl Graul, *Outline of Tamil Grammar*, Leipzig, 1855. Most important Tamil grammars of more recent times : G. U. Pope, A *Larger Grammar of the Tamil Language*, Madras 1858, Vinson's quoted Manuel, Paris 1903, J. Lazarus, *A Tamil Grammar for use in colleges*, Madras 1878, A. M. Mervart, *Grammatika Razgovornogo Tamil'-skogo Jazyka*, Moskva-Leningrad 1929, A. H. Arden, *A Progressive Grammar of Common Tamil* 4th ed. by A. C. Clayton, Madras 1934, H. Beythan, *Praktische Grammatik der Tamilsprache*, Leipzig 1943.
K. Graul, *Der Kural des Tiruvalluver*, Leipzig-London, 1856.

The Kannada language had been studied by *Kittel*, and Malayalam by *Gundert*.[13] The works of all these Caldwell's predecessors and contemporaries have several common features ; to begin with, they follow the traditions of ancient native Tamil and Kannada grammarians ; or they base their studies on Latin and Greek models, eventually (later), on English grammar. Secondly : separate languages are studied and described mostly individually, also more for practical reasons.[14] Finally, the attention of these scholars is mostly dedicated to the great literary languages, especially to Tamil and Kannada, and the so called non-literary languages of Central and North-Eastern India are nearly ignored.

On the other hand, in some works, especially in short articles published mostly in ZDMG and in JA (also in IA), the beginnings of comparative investigation may be observed. Later, there have appeared also more or less brief descriptions of the non-literary languages (Kui, Gond). The comparison of different languages has been, however, performed upon a purely synchronic level—a defect, which it was not nevertheless possible in that phase to obliterate. There has been actually made no important attempt to study the history, the development of any Dravidian language, until some two decades ago.

Thus, the comparative treatment has been isolated from the investigation of the development of different languages. As already stated, it was quite natural : ancient texts were edited only insufficiently to the needs, the oldest Tamil and Kannada texts and inscriptions were inaccessible ; the third great literary language, Telugu, was almost ignored.

---

13 Cf. Kittel's articles in IA I, II, III, Gundert's article about the Dravidian element in Sanskrit in ZDMG 1869, pp. 517—30. Also H. Gundert, *A Malayalam and English Dictionary*, Mangalore 1872.

14 With these more or less practical purposes cf. the words of Caldwell in the Preface (II. ed. p. vii) : "to promote a more systematic and scientific study of the Dravidian languages themselves—for their own sake—. . . ."

2

Considering the state of evolution reached, about 1850, in the study of Indo-European and especially Indian languages, and the phase reached by the comparative and historical method in those years, we think of Caldwell's work as of a truly outstanding achievement ; let us take into consideration that the historical and comparative method was only just born, hand in hand with the progress in Indo-European philology, and that the true great partisan and real founder of this method, *Franz Bopp*, was publishing the first edition of his Comparative Grammar during the period 1833—52 (the second, improved edition was published in 1857—61 !) : the significance of Caldwell's[15] comparative experiment appears to be unique. He united in a mighty stream tiny rivulets and rivers of scattered and split research. He laid the foundations, by his daring and singular act, to an entirely new branch of Oriental philology and opened the ways for future scholars.

In the preface to the second edition of his work Caldwell wrote that he worked " *con amore* ". And he proceeds to say : " I have endeavoured to be accurate and thorough throughout, and to leave no difficulty unsolved, or at least uninvestigated ; and yet ... I am conscious of many deficiencies, and feel sure that I must have fallen into many errors."

These certainly are rare words. Pages VI and VII of the Preface show us also the reasons why Caldwell has written his work, and the chief object of it : " It is now more than thirty-seven years since I commenced the study of Tamil, and I had not proceeded far in the study before I came to the conclusion that much light might be thrown on Tamil by comparing it with Telugu, Canarese, and the

15 Robert Caldwell, born in Ireland in 1814, after studies in London came to Madras in 1838, 1841 became a clergyman of the Church of England, devoted his activities to missionary work in the Tirunelveli district, 1877 became the bishop of Tinnevelly, died 28th August, 1891.

other sister idioms . . . It has been my chief object throughout this work to promote a more systematic and scientific study of the Dravidian languages themselves—for their own sake, irrespective of theories respecting their relationship to other languages—by means of a careful intercomparison of their grammars." This aim he fully reached by his work, and more : in the preface he succeeded in laying out several theses, valid till now and of fundamental importance.

1. Dravidian languages are not only local dialects of one language, but absolutely independent though related languages, originating from a common hypothetic source (now being called the Proto-Dravidian).

2. Dravidian languages have not developed from Sanskrit.

3. Dravidian languages have an important share in the development of North Indian or Indo-Aryan languages.

4. Tamil has, generally said, preserved the best picture of the original state. Caldwell, however, stressed that this fact had not to be overvalued and that it was necessary to reach conclusions by studying all Dravidian languages.

Even now, after a hundred years, it is possible essentially to agree with these basic theses as well as with Caldwell's description of the fundamental structure of Dravidian grammar.

Caldwell's work does not lack the wise, generalizing view. Caldwell knew how to discover the truth under whole groups of individual and explanation-resisting phenomena. This quality of his resulted in a rare foresight based on careful observation of reality, and many a small perception and idea of his gained in significance and was confirmed by future investigation.[16]

---

16 An example : p. 339 of 2nd ed. "There is reason to suspect, also, that originally it (i.e. the Dravidian verb) had no present tense, but only a future and a past." The investigation of old Tamil texts has

There is one more of Caldwell's theses—though not yet absolutely confirmed, it seems nevertheless to be more than probable. It concerns his so called Scythian theory: upon the basis of grammatical analysis and comparisons Caldwell believed the Dravidian languages to be akin to Finno-Ugrian, though they have certain features in common with Indo-European. Caldwell, it is true, was not the first to formulate this thesis (*Rask* touched upon it somewhat generally). Caldwell however has reached his conclusions independently from Rask, and supported this thesis with fairly probable and detailed comments. Later this conception was again brought to life by *O. Schrader*,[17] and recently it has been supported convincingly by Prof. *Burrow*[18] upon the basis of striking lexical parallels. Caldwell has drawn from this thesis (and from some other points, too) the conclusion that the Dravidians came to India from the North-West. In the present time, however, some important attempts may be observed to show that the Dravidians came either from the South or from the South-West by the sea-route (cf. especially the inferences of *Fuerer-Haimendorf*).[19] In a very interesting connection the problem of

clearly shown, that this thesis is right; the old Tamil verb had, in its ancient period, rather aspects than tenses; a kind of future-aorist expressed action or state indefinite in any temporal sphere, the preterite expressed action or state definite, perfective in any temporal sphere (e. g. in future, or in present).

17 O. Schrader, *Drawidisch und Uralisch*, Zeitschrift für Indologie und Iranistik, III, 1925, pp. 8—112. Further, W. von Hevesy, *Finnisch-Ugrisches aus Indien*, Wiēn, 1932, A. F. Thyagaraju, *Glossarial Affinities between Finnish and Dravidian*, QJMS, XXI, 1930, pp. 125—28, E. H. Tuttle, *Finnic and Dravidian*, New Haven, 12 pp.

18 T. Burrow, *Dravidian Studies*, IV, BSOS, XI/2, 1944, pp. 328—56. Also, K. Bouda, *Dravidisch und Uralaltaisch*, Uralaltaische Jahrbücher, XXV, 1953, pp. 161—173.

19 The reasoning of Ch. von Fuerer-Haimendorf (cf. *The Indo-Asian Culture*, II, 3, pp. 238—47), though very general, seems to be pretty sound. Two problems arise, however, instantly, as soon as we accept his correlation Iron-age megalith-builders = Dravidian-speakers and his date, viz. 500—300 B.C. First, the question of the Dravidian loanwords in Vedic Sanskrit and, second, the affinities in items between Dravidian and Uralian (the difference between the terms affinity and relationship has to be stressed here). There remain also the problems connecting with the Indus Valley seals and their language and its eventual (though not much probable) affinity to Proto-Dravidian. I believe it is hardly possible also to agree with the author's conception of Dravidian languages being so "closely akin" that they "appear rather as the branches of a group still in a state of organic growth than the remnants of a once larger complex".

the coming of the Dravidians has been mentioned by the Soviet archaeologist *S. P. Tolstov* in his book "*Po Sledam Drevnechorezmijskoj Civilizacii*", Moskva-Leningrad 1948.[20]

Caldwell's work was not only tremendously important for Dravidian philology : it has inspired *Beames* to start with the publishing of his "*Comparative Grammar of the Modern Aryan Languages of Ind.*"[21] in 1872. (Passim : the very term *Dravidian* has been coined first by Caldwell ; he formed it according to the Sanskrit *āndhra-drāviḍa-bhāsyā* found in *Kumārila Bhaṭṭa,* 7th—8th cent. A.D.).

As has been perhaps already said, Caldwell's work is not void of errors. It could hardly be otherwise. I wish only to point out in general two basic defects in his work. He based his comparison mainly upon Tamil and the other great languages (but chiefly upon Tamil), using relatively slender material. Secondly, his comparison is actually mostly limited to synchronic comparison, his method being thus not historical and comparative, but only the latter. As has been already stressed, these defects are conditioned historically : it was actually impossible for Caldwell to work otherwise since only the careful investigation and description of all non-literary languages enables, in our days, the scholars to base their comparative studies truly widely, and only the editions of the most ancient texts enable a solid investigation of the development of different languages. Both these factors could be fulfilled only half a century later.[22]

---

20 Cf. also Tolstov, *Drevnij Chorezm,* Moskva, 1948, pp. 65 and 350

21 J. Beames, *A Comparative Grammar of the Modern Aryan Languages of India,* 3 vol., London, 1872—1879.

22 Thus, e.g., Caldwell says (2nd ed., p. 130) that "the Kural of Tiruvalluvar...is generally regarded not only the best but the oldest Tamil poem of any extent which is now in existence. I think we should not be warranted in placing the date of the Kural later than the tenth century A.D." As seen also from some other pages of his work, he has regarded the 10th Century A.D. as the period of the origin of Tamil literature. It is natural, since it has been impossible for him to become acquainted with the splendid literature of the ancient Tamil lyrical anthologies, and, also, the rich epigraphic old Kannada and old Malayalam material has been inaccessible at his time.

3

There was a second and third edition of Caldwell's work in 1875 and 1913 respectively. In the second half and mainly towards the end of the last century and at the beginning of the 20th cen. there arose a situation, favourable to awakening strong national feeling among South Indian people, on account of socio-economic factors and political conditions, a situation which led to a vigorous cultural and literary *rinascimento* in South India. Under the influence of this *rinascimento* modern national prose and poetry arose, connected with such names as *S. Bharathi* in Tamil literature, with the unique figure of *Veeresalingam* among the Telugus, with the birth of the journal *Vagbhushana* and the foundation of the *Kannada Literary Academy* in Karnatak, and with the first works of the Malayalam national poet *Vallathol*. More interesting for us is the reaction to this renaissance in the world of learning. The brilliant figure of *Dr. U. V. Swaminathaiyar* shines out on the horizon of the Tamil renaissance movement immortal in his merits for critical editions of voluminous texts of ancient literary periods. In the Kannada sphere, the *Epigrafia Carnatica* started and the publication of *Kavya Kalanidhi*. At the same time, the unique Kannada-English dictionary of *Kittel* was published. Further monographic studies by *Kittel, Vinson, Pope* and *Konow* are published ; these and some other works show also interest in problems connected with the relation of Dravidian and Sanskrit. By the Sanskritists themselves, by the "classical" Indologists and Indo-Europeanists they are, however, sadly ignored.

Simultaneously, the description of non-literary languages does not lag behind : *Hahn* published the grammar of *Kurukh* (1900), *Williamson* and *Haid* investigated *Gond*[23] etc. Small comparative studies of course often took

---

23 Hahn, *Kurukh Grammar*, Calcutta 1900 ; *Kurukh (Orao)—English Dictionary*, Calcutta, 1903. Williamson, *Gondi Grammar and Vocabulary*, London, 1890. Haig, *A Comparative Vocabulary of the Gondi and Koldmi Languages*, JAS, Being. LXVI, I, 1897.

byways and there was a lot of doubt and meandering. Thus *Pope*, who otherwise deserved great merit for his outstanding work in Tamil language and literature, delved into phantastic comparison (in Indian Antiquary, 8) when connecting e.g. Tamil *kulam* and Engl. *clan*, Tam. *maṉai* and Engl. *mansion*, Tam. *nākku* and Latin *lingua*.

All these and similar works result in a new attempt of synthesis, this time by an Indian author, *Subayya* (1909, 1911), in Indian Antiquary. In spite of the fact that Subayya's articles brought much that was new and that they have had their important place in the evolution of Dravidian comparative philology, they did not contribute a fundamental and decisive share in the formation of a new conception of the system of Dravidian languages as a whole. Unfortunately, Subayya's work has remained a torso.

However, a few years before there appeared in Calcutta (in 1906) the monumental work of Indian linguistics, the *Linguistic Survey of India*. Its fourth volume, compiled by *Sten Konow*, is dedicated mainly to Dravidian languages. The results which had been reached have been resumed in this magnificent work; different languages have been described with the utmost thoroughness then possible, texts have been appended as well as a complete bibliography to every section. Nevertheless, what has been said of Subayya's works, holds also for LSI. Though a corner-stone of Dravidian philology, it did not change the views and conceptions and put a new, bold theory answering the most difficult questions.

With this work and with Subayya's synthetic articles the second period of evolution of Dravidian comparative philology, characterized by further attempts at a more profound analysis and a wider synthesis, has been closed.

4

The next, modern period may be characterized by the demand expressed in 1929 by the Nestor of contemporary

Indian linguistics, *Suniti Kumar Chatterji*: "What we want is a series of rigorously scientific grammars of all important Dravidian languages ... A series of historical and comparative grammars of Tamil, Telugu and Kannada...with analogous forms from the other Dravidian languages would be ideal."

Conditions for such work may have been considered as ripe during that period. Significant ancient material, both literary and epigraphic, has been published or is being published with considerable zeal. This enables the scholars to penetrate into the past of the languages. New, detailed and safe grammars of the non-literary languages enable the linguists to apply the comparative method with a fair amount of success.[24]

Typical for this period is the entry of Indian scholars upon the tilt-yard of science. Let us remember only two outstanding research-workers, *Prof. L. V. Ramaswami Aiyar* and *Subr. Sastri.*[25] Thus, slowly but safely, a true

---

24 Denys Bray, *The Brahui Language*, I, Calcutta 1909, II—III, Delhi 1934. A. Grignard, *A Grammar of the Oraon Language* and *Oraon-English Dictionary*, Calcutta, 1924. Ch. Trench, *Grammar of Gondi as spoken in the Betul district*, Madras, 1919—21.—A. N. Mitchell, *A Grammar of Maria Gondi*, Jagdalpur, 1942.—W. W. Winfield, *A Grammar of the Kui Language*, Calcutta, 1928. id., *A Vocabulary of the Kui Language*, Calcutta, 1929.

25 As far as the works of L. V. R. Aiyar are concerned, it would be useful to compile a complete bibliography of these works, scattered in different magazines and journals. I wish to contribute with the following list:

1929 *Notes on Dravidian* I—IV, IHQ, 1929.
Austric and Dravidian, Q.M.S., Oct. 1929.
Plosives of Dravidian, IA, 1929.
1930 *Dravidic Etymologies*, JAHRS, 1930, 1—2.
Prossemy and Ecsemy in Dravidian, JBORS, XVI, 1.
Kui Words and Dravidian Origins, JOR IV, 2.
Dravidic Perspectives, QJMS, Oct. 1930.
World-Parallels between Dravidian and other Language-Families, Educ. Review, Jan. 1930.
Problems of Dravidian Linguistics. I. Etymological Studies. ib., May 1930.
1931 *Notes on Dravidian*, IHQ, VII, 1931.
Dravidic Forms for Betel Leaf, JOR V, 1.
Dravidian Names Denoting Peacock and Bat, JBORS, XVI, 3—4.
Dravidic Names for Palms, JBORS, XVII.
Dravidic Word-Studies, JAHRS, VI, 1.
Some Dravidic Plant-names, JOR 1931, 156—66.

comparative Dravidian phonology originates, connected with such names as L. V. R. Aiyar, the American scholar *Tuttle* and others. The scholars are deeply interested chiefly in the problems of etymology and substratum.[26] A new conception of the development of Indian languages may be observed, mainly in the sphere of the "linguistic prehistory of India": the Dravidian languages had an important share in the evolution of Indo-Aryan since the times of the Vedic dialect itself, just as the Dravidian component in the complicated pattern of Indian culture and society and religion is being stressed. The University of Madras has published in 1926—36 the monumental *Tamil* Lexicon, comprising 104-405 items. Prof. L. V. R. Aiyar has published some works which represent the beginnings of true historical investigation of Tamil and Malayalam. In 1941 the Indian scholar Narasimhia published the grammar of the oldest Kanarese inscriptions, in 1937 a history of the Telugu language (unfortunately in Telugu) was

---

1932 *A Problem of Dravidic Phonology*, JOR, V, p. 1. *Tulu Prose Texts in Two Dialects*, BSOS, VI, pp. 897—930.

1933 *Dravidic Problems*, IA, 1933, pp. 46—56.
Initial Fricatives and Affricates in Dravidian, ib., 141—8..

1935 *Tamil L.* JOR IX, pp. 140—7, 195—210.

1936 *Materials for a Sketch of Tulu Phonology*, Bull. Ling. Soc. Ind. VI, 1936, pp. 385—439.
The Evolution of Malayalam Morphology, Ernakulam, 1936.
Dravidic "Eating" and "Drinking", IHQ XII, pp. 258—69.

1937 The *History of the Tamil-Malayalam Alveolar Plosive*, J. Madr. Univ. VIII. 1937.
A Primer of Malayalam Phonology, Bull. Rama Varma Inst., 1937.

1938 *The Morphology of the Old Tamil Verb*, Anthropos 38, pp. 747—81.
A Fifteenth Century Malayalam Prose Text, The Maharaja's College Magazine, Ernakulam, 21/1, 1938.

In 1925 appeared *A Brief Account of Malayalam Phonetics* (pp. 31), Calcutta University Press, 1925.

Subrahmanya Sastri, *History of Grammatical Theories in Tamil*, Madras, 1934.

26 Cf. also Levi—Przyluski—Bloch: *Pre-Aryan and Pre-Dravidian in India*, Calcutta 1929. J. Przyluski. *Pre-Dravidian or Proto-Dravidian*, IHQ, VI, IV °1, 1930, pp. 145—9, id. *Le nom du ble*, RO, 1928 (30), 125—9, id. *Le nom du dieu Visnu* ... ArOr, IV, 2, 1932, 261—7, F. O. Schrader, *A Curious Case of Idiomatic Sanskrit*, BSOS, VI, 2, 1931, p. 481, J. Carpentier, *The Meaning and Etymology of Puja*, IA, 1927, pp. 93—99, 130—136, Ch. Chakravarty, *Meaning and Etymology of Puja*, IA, 1928, p. 140, F. O. Schrader, *Ein Syntaktisches Problem der Indischen Sprachfamilien*, ZII, 6, 1928, pp. 72—82.

published by *C. N. Rao.*[27] Different scholars begin to specialize methodically. To the most important works of this period belong the articles of *Prof. Burrow* of Oxford and *Prof. Emeneau* of Berkeley. The first dedicates his attention to important problems of Dravidian phonology and phonetics, etymology and the relation between Dravidian and Sanskrit; he has also supported Caldwell's old theory (however altered to some respects) about the affinity of Dravidian and Finno-Ugrian. An interesting Tamil grammar has been published in the USSR in 1929 (*Mervart, A. M., Grammatika Razgovornogo Tamil'skogo Jazyka*), which tries to explain the language from a new and different point of view, starting from Tamil itself without any preconceived theory and terminology.

This period of feverish activity, the period of the origin of a whole series of new works and new methods may be considered as closed by a new attempt of synthesis, this time by *Prof. Jules Bloch.* In 1946 he published his "*Structure Grammatical des Languages Dravidiennes*". In the introduction, he says that his work is far from being so ambitious as the work of Caldwell; his is only a "*cadre prēparatoir ā des etudes plus approfondies*", based mostly upon the investigation of non-literary languages (whereas Caldwell has started from Tamil). Bloch's work, full of unique ideas and ingenious and thought-provoking suggestions, is actually a preparatory work, showing the ways and directions of further study. It cannot be considered (and neither it has been the purpose of its author) as a detailed synthesis of Dravidian comparative problems.

It may seem that, in the first half of the 20th Century a lot has been done in the field of Dravidian comparative philology. Through reliable and more or less detailed description of languages such as Kui, Brahui, Gond, Tulu, the

---

27 C. Narayana Rao, *History of the Telugu Language*, Waltair, 1937. — A. N. Narasimhia, *A Grammar of the Oldest Kanarese Inscriptions*, Mysore, 1941.

foundations have been laid of a solid comparative method of the future. The editions of old texts and epigraphs, Tamil, Telugu, Malayalam and Kanarese, enable solid historical investigation. On the other hand, only the foundations have been laid. That means that, at the present time, the period of small, detailed, solid work on different problems begins, which will serve as the building-material of a future synthesis. In other words, considerable success has been attained in the descriptive work. Now it remains to solve the problems, to discover the laws and to explain them, historically and comparatively. However, even in the sphere of mere description there are serious lacunas to be found.

Thus we may briefly sketch out the present state of comparative Dravidian philology. Time is ripe to create some sort of international collaboration of the scholars and research-centres ; it would be ideal to have a special international scientific journal dedicated only to the problems of Dravidian philology and linguistics, further, to have periodical bibliographic issues and, finally, international conferences of Dravidianists from time to time.

The most important tasks of the past are also being solved at present : the descriptions of the non-literary Dravidian languages on a static, synchronic level. To this group belong the most important works of the present time, *Kota Texts* by *M. B. Emeneau* and an excellent grammar of *Kolami* by the same author, appended by a copious etymologic vocabulary, as well as the outstanding work of *Prof. Burrow* and *S. Bhattacharya*, a descriptive grammar of *Purji* with texts and vocabulary.[28] Through these and other

---

[28] Murray B. Emeneau, *Kota Texts*, University of California Publications in Linguistics, vol. 1, 1944, vols. 2 and 3, 1944—46. — M. B. Emeneau, *Kolami, A Dravidian Language*. University of California Publications in Linguistics, 1955. — Also, by the same author : *Personal Names of the Todas*. American Anthropologist 40, 1938, *Echo-Words in Toda*, New IA I, 1938. — *A Study of Toda Kinship Terms and Dual Descent*, Language, Culture and Personality, Menasha, Wisconsin, pp. 158—79, *Proto-Dravidian c- : Toda t-*, BSOAS 1953, XV/1, pp. 98—112,

works, the universities of *Berkeley* in California, U. S. A. and in *Oxford,* England, lead in contemporary Dravidian studies, besides the third centre, *Poona* in India. It seems that Prof. Burrow has founded a school.[29] The American and English centres are in close contact and collaboration ; besides the descriptive work on the non-literary languages these scholars deal mostly with etymological and phonetic problems, and Emeneau and Burrow promised the world a work which undoubtedly will open a new chapter in the history of Dravidian studies, viz., a large etymological, comparative dictionary of the Dravidian languages.[30] The third important centre, *Poona* in India, is characterized by some interesting works in phonetics and phonemics,[31] and, chiefly, by two very important works dealing with the historical aspect of Dravidian philology : *Gai's* historical grammar of *Old Kannada,* published in 1946 and *Sekhar's* work *Evolution of Malayalam* (1953).[32] These works represent the beginnings (they are actually purely descriptive, presentational grammars of the respective languages during a certain phase of evolution) of the realization of the most important plan conceived in Poona : the publishing of

---

Linguistic Pre-history of India. Proceedings of the Amer. Philos, Soc. 98/4, 1954, pp. 282—92 etc. — T. Burrow — S. Bhattacharya, *The Parji Language*, Hertford. 1953. Also, by T. Burrow, *Dravidic Studies*, BSOS, IX, 1938, 711—22, X, 1940, 289—97, XI, 1943, 122—39, 595—616, XII, 1947, 132—47, 366—96 etc.

29 Under preparation, at this school, is a descriptive grammar of the verbal forms of the Sangam texts (Early Old Tamil).

30 " Professor T. Burrow of Oxford University and I have initiated a collaboration looking towards it, and hope that ten years may see us at the end of our labours " (M. B. Emeneau, BSOAS, 1953, XV/1, p. 99).

31 Cf. especially C. R. Sankaran, *Phonemics of Old Tamil*, Poona 1951 and a series of articles by the Professor and his pupils published in the BDRCI. With regard to phonetics and phonology, cf. J. R. Firth, *Tamil Phonetics*, Appendix to A. H. Arden, *A Progressive Grammar of Common Tamil*, 4th ed., Madras 1943. Also P. Meile, *Sur la sifflante en Dravidien*, JA, 1934—35, pp. 73—89, M. G. Venkatesaioh, *The Initial-Surd-Medicl Sonant Postulate in Kannada*, J. Mythic Soc. XLV, 1955/3 pp. 135—47, svarny—Zvelebil, *Some Remarks on the Articulation of the " Cerebral " Consonants in Indian Languages, Especially in Tamil*, ArOr 1955, 3, pp. 374—434, A. M. Pizzagalli : *L'origine delle linguali nell'antico indiano e l'influsso dravidico. Silloge linguistica dedicata alla memoria di Graziadio Isaia Ascoli*, Torino, 1929, pp. 152—169.

32 G. S. Gai, *Historical Grammar of Old Kannada*, Poona 1946. — A. C. Sekhar, *Evolution of Malayalam*, Poona 1953.

historical grammars of the great Dravidian languages.[33] The scholars of Poona have also prepared a work of outstanding merit in compiling a complete bibliography of works dealing with Dravidian philology.[34]

There are some other places in South India, which show the marks of lively activity as far as Dravidian linguistics is concerned : in this connection it is necessary to mention the *University of Travancore* in Trivandrum,[35] *The Academy of Tamil Culture* in Madras and its journal, the "*Tamil Culture*", the *University of Madras*, the *Annamalai University*. Often this work is marked by some devious trends and initial difficulties which are a sign of every beginning. But is also mostly characterized by the promising enthusiasm of youth.

Paris, after the glorious tradition marked by the names of Vinson and Bloch, has been bereft of the brilliant intellect and wide knowledge of *Jules Bloch*,[36] who died in 1953. As far as I am informed, *P. Meile* may be now regarded as the representant of French Dravidianists.

The Dravidian problems form a considerable part of interests of *Prof. F. B. Kuiper* of Leiden,[37] *Prof. M. Mayr-*

---

33 Cf. Sekhar, *Evolution of Malayalam*, Preface : " ... the plan of the Dravidian department of the Deccan College Research Institute for studying all the four principal Dravidian languages on a historical basis before attempting a comparative study of them stage by stage."

34 " A fairly exhaustive bibliography of Dravidian Philology recording over 800 references, has already been prepared by the present writer which will be published as soon as possible " (the translator's Preface to the English rendering of Bloch's *Structure* by Ramkrishna Ganesh Harshe, p. XII).

35 The Tamil department is led by *Prof. V. I. Subramaniam*, M.A., Ph. D.

36 The bibliography of the works of J. Bloch may be found on pp. XXI—XXIV of the English rendering of his "*Structure*", which appeared in Poona under the title "*The Grammatical Structure of Dravidian Languages*", 1954.

37 Cf. F. B. J. Kuiper, *Zur chronologie des Stimmtonverlustes im dravidischen Anlaut*, BSOS, IX, 1939, pp. 987—1001. *Also, Note on Dravidian Morphology*, Acta Orientalia, 1948, pp. 238—52 and *Proto-Munda Words in Sanskrit*, Amsterdam 1948, *Two Rigvedic loanwords*, Sprachgeschichte und Wortbedeutung, Festschrift A. Debrunner 1954, 241—50,

hofer[38] of Wurzburg, *A. Master* and *L. Lisker.*

It remains to say a few modest and brief words about Prague. The traditions of the Prague interests in Dravidian languages, especially in Tamil, root in a more remote past than it may seem at the first glance. A word has been already said about Przikryl S.J., living about the middle of the 18th Cent. Professor *A. Ludwig* treated the Dravidian verbal flexion in an interesting article[39] published in 1900 and in the Prague University Library his notes have been found which prove his live interest especially in Tamil and Malayalam.[40]

The first who treated Dravidian problems on wider scale in Prague was Professor *Otakar Pertold.*[41] Due to

---

Rigvedic Loanwords, Studia Indologica, Festschrift W. Kirfel 1955, 137—85. A very important work.

38 Cf. M. Mayrhofer, *CurzgejaBtes Etymologisches Wortehbuch des Altindischen,* Heidelberg, *Die Substrattheorien und das Indische,* Gemanisch-Romanische Monatsschrift 34, 233—34 and fn. 9, 1953, *Arische Landnahme und Indische Altbevolkerung im Spiegel der altindischen sprache,* Saeculum, 1951, 2, 54—64, *Etymologische Miszellen,* ArOr XVIII, 4, 68—77, *Neue Literatur zu den Substraten im Altindischen,* ib. 367—371. — Among the works of further scholars, who have been mentioned only *passim* or not at all in the text, the following may be quoted : P. Meile, *Quelques Particularites due Sondhi au Tamoul,* BSL, XLV, 1949/71, pp. 135—45, A. Master, *Indo-Aryan and Dravidian,* BSOS XI, 1944, pp. 297—307, *The Zero Negative in Dravidian,* TPS, 1946, 137, H. H. Figulla, *Die Struktur des Verbums in den Dravidischen, Sprachen,* Mitteilungen des Seminars fur Orientalische Sprachen an der Friedrich-Wilhelms-Univers. zu Berlin, 35, 1932, pp. 195—204, L. Lisker, *Tamil Verb Classification,* JAOS 71, 1951, 111—4. It is to be hoped that the bibliography, prepared in Poona by R. H. Harshe, will be as complete as possible.

39 A. Ludwig, *Uber die Verbalflexion der Dravidasprachen,* Prag 1900.

40 K. Zvelebil, *Collectanea zur Tamil-Grammatik von der Hand des † Alfred Ludwig,* ArOr XXI, 1953, 427—9.

41 Much material is to be found in his books *Perla indickeho oceanu (The Pearl of the Indian Ocean),* Praha 1926, pp. 941 and *Jihoindicke vzpomlnky (South Indian Remembrances),* Praha 1919, pp. 108. Cf. also the articles *Die Ceylonische Gottin Pottini,* ArOr XIII, pp. 201—24 and *Problem Sinhalstiny (The Problem of Sinhalese),* MNHMA, 1926, pp. 249—63. He was also the first to translate from Tamil prose into Czech. In Ms. are Prof. Pertold's University lectures on Tamil grammar (1953). It is a matter of great regret that it was impossible for Prof. Pertold to publish his rich Sinhalese and Tamil phonetic material, recorded in wax-cylindres of old type during his first stay in Ceylon and India. This material, comprising more than 100 cylindres, has been destroyed owing to unfavourable climatic circumstances and inexpert keeping.

circumstances of different nature he however turned his attention more to the ethnographic side of the Dravidian problem and to the questions of primitive religions.

Today, we try to contribute to comparative Dravidian studies with researches, dealing with descriptive phonetics and especially with work in the *earliest strata of Tamil language*. Our work is directed towards a broader contribution which may be characterized as the investigation of *Tamil* in its *diachronic, historic* and *synchronic static* aspects.[42]

It is evident even from this incomplete enumeration of the most typical works and trends that, in the present, we may witness a new mighty development and progress in the sphere of Dravidian linguistics. Not very numerous are the scholars who are contributing to this development. They are charged with the enormity of material and with the importance and complexity of the tasks necessary to solve. This is another reason why they ought to unite in their endeavours, plan their work, have their own international journal and their meetings. The tasks which have to be solved might be—very briefly—characterized as follows :

1. As far as the *synchronic description* of a given stage of different Dravidian languages is concerned, it is possible to say with some exaggeration that the chief task has been achieved. Nevertheless, a lot is to be done even here : there are some languages (e.g. Badaga, Toda, the languages of the Kurumbas) which are still not described —and some of them quickly vanishing.

---

[42] Cf. Kamil Zvelebil, *The Enclitic Vowels (-a, -e, -o) in Modern Tamil*, ArOr, XXII, 1954, pp. 375—405, *Two Etymological Remarks*, ArOr, XXII, pp. 586—7, O. Svarny-K. Zvelebil, *Some Remarks on the Articulation of the "cerebral" Consonants in Indian Languages Especially in Tamil*, ArOr XXIII, 1955, pp. 374—434, Kamil Zvelebil, *The Present State of Dravidian Philology*, Tamil Culture 1955/1, *On Emphasis and Intensification in Tamil*, ArOr XXIII, pp. 435—64, *A Note on Tamil Verbal Morphology*, ib. pp. 479—81, *Short Remarks on Old Tamil Syntax*, ib. XXIV, 1, 1956, pp. 120—122.

2. It is of utmost necessity to begin with the *dialectology* and *linguistic geography* of Dravidian. There are some highly important dialects, e.g. in Tamil (cf. the Tamil dialect of Jaffna, of the Tirunelvēli district, Burgandī and Kaikādī), in Malayalam (Kāḍar) etc., which it is necessary to describe sooner before they completely disappear.

3. One of the most important task is to investigate into the *history*, into the *evolution* of the four great literary languages. In future, the comparative treatment must be connected closely with the historical investigation. The future synthesis must be based upon comparative and historical method of approach.

Only after the historical grammars of different Dravidian languages are thus worked out—which, in itself, needs enormous efforts and great work with the description and classification of material—it will be possible to set to work on a new, monumental comparative synthesis. In this future synthesis, based upon solid historical and comparative investigation without ignoring the solution of structural and synchronic problems, is to be seen the legacy of Robert Caldwell and his immortal work, which appeared just one hundred years ago.

News and Notes

A LETTER FROM MAURITIUS

Mr. R. Sooriamoorthy, 80, Etienne Pellevan Street, Port Louis, Mauritius, writes :—

*   *   *   *   *

I should also be grateful if you could send me any of your back numbers dealing with the religion of the Tamils. At present there is a controversy in the local press. Some write that a Tamil is a Hindu while others maintain that a Tamil is not a Hindu. Which is which ? I should be glad if you could help to enlighten me on this subject.

.   .   .   .   .

MSS. OF BESCHI'S TAMIL GRAMMAR FOUND

It is my duty to bring to the notice of the public, through your columns, an important find that has been made at our College recently. Stored away in a drawer, our Librarian discovered a good-sized leather-bound, hand-written manuscript, obviously far from modern. The top portion of many of the pages had been damaged by damp. The title page had crumpled away ; but the top of the first page bore the date 1728 and the name of Constantine Joseph Beschi was easily visible, in the superscription. The book was in Latin. A comparison of the Latin text with the English translations of Beschi's works, which we have in the library, left no doubt that the manuscript was that of Beschi's well-known grammar of Tamil prose, entitled *Kodun Thamil.*

For the following reasons it is clear that the manuscript belongs to the 18th century :

The volume is obviously old. Besides this, the script with its flourishes and its long 's', written like an 'f'

still prevalent in German, when writing a double 's' belongs to the 18th century.

In the 19th century English had displaced Latin. And an English translation of the same work by Christopher Horst had been published as early as 1806.

No person who wanted the book merely for its instruction would have been at pains to copy out the two prefaces that occur in the book.

A book copied merely for instructional purposes by a European student would not have been preserved so carefully as this volume had been done by the Cassamajor family to whom this belonged. The family as is well-known was associated with the East India Company (A street in Madras is named after one of the Cassamajors).

Could it then be that this manuscript might belong to the 18th century but might not be the original manuscript ? It is hardly possible that, when the text was available in print somebody should out of pure sentiment have copied it out in full. One cannot conceive of a work on Kodun Thamil being copied out for sentiment.

What presented the real problem with the volume was that it contained not merely Beschi's own grammar, but a supplement also in Latin entitled *Observationes Grammaticae* by the Danish missionary, Christopher Theodosius Walther. Beschi's text runs into 176 pages, Walther's into 60 pages. Walther himself in his preface, dated 1739, states that Beschi's book was printed at his press in Tranquebar, the year before. How then came the two to be in the same volume ? There is no doubt that Beschi's book, though written in 1728, went to the press in 1738. Many persons have therefore concluded that this was also the date of publication. Walther says in the preface to his tract that it was a supplement to Beschi's grammar. Could the supplement then have come out separately the next year ? If so, why should both texts appear in the same volume ?

Dr. Arno Lehmann of Halle-Wittenburg University in his account of the Danish Mission in Tranquebar, entitled

"It began in Tranquebar", provides the answer. He says (p. 121) :

> On 16th October, the diary records that the Walther's *Observationes Grammaticae* appeared as an appendix to Beschi's grammar. Beschi himself was not very happy about this, but his Bishop, Don Joseph Pinheire (1726-1744) of Madras, was lifted 'up to heaven' according to a letter of missionary Obuch.

Horst has no preface to his translation, either in the first edition or the second edition (1831). A better and more authoritative translation by G. W. Nahon came out in 1848 ; and though like Horst, he does not translate Walther, he says in his preface that Beschi's book was published by the Tranquebar Press in 1739. The reason for the omission of Walther's supplement by both translators is easily intelligible. But it is clear that both Beschi's book and the supplement first came out together.

In 18th century Indian things at a Press went on much more slowly than now. Ziegenbalg's New Testament bears the date 1714, but actually took one more year to come out. Walther himself wrote a Sanskrit grammar but could not have it printed at his own Press, owing to paper shortage. The Bangalore manuscript, therefore, seems clearly to be the copy of both Beschi's grammar as well as the supplement which originally came out.

However the manuscript we have cannot be in the handwriting of Beschi himself. The script of both texts is uniform ; and neither with its exactness represents the kind of thing that is usually turned out by an author. Beschi himself for his Tamil writings employed a number of amaenuenses. Where the book contained an admixture of both Latin and Tamil, the final copy had to be done by a Press expert. It is that copy which, we think, we have in our possession. After treating the damaged portions, we expect to have the manuscript open for public view.

A discovery like this reminds us how much credit is due to the small band of foreign scholars who have

attempted to make Tamil known and popular outside India. Whereas Sanskrit has engaged the attention of many foreign scholars, in the field of Tamil scholarship, foreign readers have been few: Ziegenbalg, Beschi, Caldwell and Pope. All honour to them, therefore. But Beschi was the greatest of them and perhaps the greatest foreign scholar of any Indian language, as he was the only one who wrote a first-class epic in the language he had mastered.

REV. J. R. CHANDRAN,
Principal, United Theological
College, Bangalore.

TAMIL ISAI RESEARCH

Inaugurating the eleventh *Thevara Pann* research conference held under the auspices of the Tamil Isai Sangham at the Annamalai Manram, Mr. P. V. Rajamannar, Chief Justice of the Madras High Court, exhorted musicologists to conduct research for finding out in what melodies the ancient devotional songs should be rendered.

Mr. Rajamannar said that there could be no doubt that there was an indigenous system of music in an advanced state of development in Tamil Nad even before the beginning of the Christian era. The Tamil names of the seven swaras were not the same as those now current in the South, namely, *sa, ri, ga, ma, pa, da, ni.* The ancient Tamil names were *Kural, Thuttam, Kaikkilai, Uzhai, Ili, Vilari* and *Taram.* It was difficult to say whether these corresponded exactly to the *Saptha Swaras* now in vogue.

The Chief Justice said that the devotional songs of great Saivite and Vaishnavite saints were masterly examples of musical compositions. The word *Pann* had been generally used in connection with the *Thevaram* songs. But in his view *Pann* connoted a complete or heptatonic set of scales, now called *raga.* There was evidence to show there were hundreds of these *panns.* The music of the *Nayanmars* and *Alwars* must have had a great influence

in finally settling the forms of Carnatic music, though in later days the text books came to be written in Sanskrit.

Mr. Rajamannar said that with the passing of time, there must have been radical changes in the way the songs of *Nayanmars* and *Alwars* were rendered, as the continuity of the Tamil musical tradition had been broken. The Tamil Isai Sangham had taken up the task of reviving the sacred hymns from the predicament into which they had fallen.

Calling for extensive research to find out how the devotional songs should be sung, Mr. Rajamannar said that there should be a collection by tape recordings of the *Thevarams* and other Saivite and Vaishnavite hymns rendered by musicians attached to the temples. One could not say if they could secure the original pattern of these songs. But they could certainly obtain renderings of these songs in a more orthodox form than those prevailing now. Mr. Rajamannar felt that the old melodies in which these songs were rendered might be found preserved in Kerala as that region had, on account of certain natural advantages, been able to preserve their ancient traditions more than the other parts, therefore, intensive research might be made in that region. In this context, he mentioned that it had been recently decided to find out how the *ashtapathis* of Jayadeva were being sung in the temples in Kerala.

Mr. Ariyakudi Ramanuja Iyengar, in his presidential address, said that there were a number of *Panns* about which mention was made in *Thiruvoymozhi.* Research should be conducted on these *Panns,* as well as on the *Panns* mentioned in *Thevaram.* He assured his support to the Tamil Isai Sangham in this task.

He said that as a result of the research conducted so far, the nature of about 103 *Panns* had been ascertained. Steps should be taken to see that there was uniformity in the rendering of *Thevaram* and other *Pasurams,* at least in respect of *Panns* about which final conclusions had been reached at the conference.

Mr. Ramanuja Iyengar exhorted all musicians to join in the research and felt that, if possible, research in *ragas* and *thalas* might be done along with research in *pann*.

Earlier, Mr. T. M. Narayanaswami Pillai, President of the Tamil Isai Sangham, welcomed the gathering.

"Azhagar Kuravanji", a dance drama of Kavi Kunjara Bharathiar, directed by Srimathi K. Lalitha of the Saraswathi Gana Nilayam under the supervision of Prof. P. Sambamurthi was then staged.

—*The Hindu* (26th December, 1960).

EVIDENCE OF LOST CONTINENT IN INDIAN OCEAN

Soviet Research Team's Findings

Professor P. Bezrukov, head of the Scientists abroad the Soviet research ship Vityaz, now berthed at King George's Dock, Kidderpore, said here yesterday that they had collected numerous specimens of rare flora and fauna from the Arabian Sea and the Pacific, Atlantic and Indian oceans.

Prof. Bezrukov, who was speaking at a Press conference aboard the ship, said that the phenomena they had noticed would help scientists to prepare a history of the oceans.

With the help of ten scientific groups consisting of about 70 scientists including specialists in physical and chemical oceanography, meteorology, marine geology, geophysics, marine biology and astronomy, they had collected about 350 species of fishes, and discovered new features in the ocean bottom topography and new submarine ridges, he added.

When asked whether they had been able to find traces of the 'old Indian continent', Prof. Bezrukov said that in the western part of the Indian Ocean they had found traces of the old Indian continent of Mesozoic period—the second

geological period — about 100 million years back. The rocks and the flora and fauna of the period could only be established after thorough research of the sediment, he said.

In the eastern side of the Indian Ocean, however, they could not trace the old Indian continent. It was a most complicated task and would require continuous research for a long time, Prof. Bezrukov added.

The most conspicuous submarine ridge which the Soviet research scientists discovered was situated about 550 miles south-east of Ceylon in the Indian Ocean. It was traversed by the 'Vityaz' on a track 150-mile long. Above the ridge a submarine mountain, about 3,000 metres (about 10,000 ft.) in height was discovered by the echo-sounding method and named after Afanasy Nikitin, the first Russian who navigated the Indian Ocean in the 15th century.

—*The Hindu*, 22-2-61.

STUDY OF LINGUISTICS — FRENCH CO-OPERATION

New Block Opened at Annamalai Nagar

Mr. C. Subramaniam, Minister for Education and Finance, declared open, last night, the Linguistics Block of the Annamalai University.

Dr. Raja Sir M. A. Muthiah Chettiar, Pro-Chancellor, who presided, said that the University from the beginning was interested specially in developing linguistic studies and that great savants in Tamil and Sanskrit like Swaminatha Aiyar, Dandapaniswamy Deekshithar, Pandithamani Kathiresan Chettiar had served the University and from this point of view, the Linguistics Department with its bias for language studies was but a fruition of that old ideal of this University.

Help from France Promised

The French Representative at Pondicherry, M. Dompgnac Latour, welcomed the special efforts of the Annamalai

University in developing French language and literature and offered the help of institutions at Pondicherry and the French Embassy and their full support for the programme by way of men and material.

M. Latour added : " I have been asked by the French Embassy in Delhi, to inform you that all necessary steps are being taken to send you a full-time French Professor who will teach in Annamalai University from the beginning of the next Academic year. Besides, it may be possible to send a deputation of French students to the Annamalai University for *carrying on research work in Dravidian languages* and culture as well as Professors and scholars of French Universities to lecture here for a short period. The researches conducted by your University are known and highly praised by the Paris University. The presence of Mr. Filliozat, our great savant, at the head of the French Institute in Pondicherry, is also a sure guarantee of a close co-operation between your University and similar centres in France in the domain of Linguistics, which is one of the main fields of research work here."

Professor T. P. Meenakshisundaram Pillai, Head of the Department of Linguistics and Head of the Department of Tamil (Arts) proposed a vote of thanks.

—*The Hindu*, 3-3-61.

Book Reviews

DRAVIDIAN COMPARATIVE VOCABULARY VOLUME I

The recent publication by the Madras University of Dravidian Comparative Vocabulary, Volume I is a valuable contribution to Orientology. The book has been carefully prepared and edited jointly by the Heads of the Departments of Research in Tamil, Telugu, Malayalam and Kannada in the University of Madras.

As an adjunct to the Comparative Grammar of the Dravidian languages prepared by Dr. Caldwell in the last century, this book is sure to promote further researches in Dravidology. Though stray attempts have been made so far here and there to establish on a scientific level the relationship in point of materials of expression among the various Dravidian languages, a systematic work has not been produced until now. This work which bears the stamp of scholars eminent in their respective languages therefore bids fair to become the recognised authority in this direction.

Another comparative Dravidian Vocabulary in preparation jointly by Professor T. Burrow of the Indian Institute, Oxford, and Professor R. B. Emeneau of the University of California is tending to become another welcome addition on the subject.

In the book under review, two thousand words appear with the corresponding equivalents in Tamil, Telugu, Malayalam and Kannada and sometimes in Tulu too. The book is divided into 22 sections like names of Heavenly Bodies, Cardinal points, Flora and Fauna, Human Body,Household Articles etc., etc. Nearly one-third of the book has been devoted to the Fauna and Flora of the Dravidian land. The next importance has been given to words appertaining to

the human body. Words concerning Buildings and Food Products have also received great attention. One, however, might desire to find greater number and greater variety of cultural words than one finds in this book, for the total number of words in the cultural section are under forty. Probably, in the next volume cultural words in large numbers may be presented.

The work, so far as it goes, however, is a wealth of information on the subject. It not only furnishes us with information about the allied and altered forms in which the same word appears in different Dravidian languages, but serves as a valuable guide-book to Research Scholars who might embark on a morpho-phonemic analysis of their respective languages.

A note-worthy feature of the book is that it has, in addition to the transliterated forms, the actual Dravidian words in the script of the concerned language side by side. This book has been brought out as a result of arduous and difficult labour for about twenty years, as has been pointed out in the preface by Dr. A. L. Mudaliar, the Vice-Chancellor of the University. Dr. R. P. Sethu Pillai (Professor of Tamil), Sri N. Venkata Rao (Reader in Telugu), Dr. S. K. Nayar (Reader in Malayalam) and Sri M. Mariappa Bhat (Professor of Kannada) deserve hearty congratulations on the successful manner in which they have conjointly brought out this book.

A. C. C.

TIRUKKURAL (in Hindi)

By Dr. S. Shankar Raju Naidu, M.A., Ph.D.,
Head of the Department of Hindi, University of Madras,
Madras-5. Published by University of Madras.

The Tirukkural of Tiruvalluvar is the pride of Tamilakam as of all India and it behoves all non-Tamil knowing public of India, especially of the distant north to get intimately acquainted with the true glories of this pre-eminent

treasure of the ancient Tamil classics. As the learned Vice-Chancellor of the Madras University, Dr. Sir A. Lakshmanaswamy Mudaliar, in his foreword to the Hindi translation of this great work has pertinently remarked, " the message of Tiruvalluvar, as outlined in the Kural is a message for all humanity and at no time is such a message more needed than at the present ". The learned authority goes on further to point out the dire need at the moment for such a translation. " It is unfortunate," says he, " that while the treasures of the ancient Tamil classics are better known and better appreciated by scholars in the western lands, very little attention has been paid to such works by scholars in other parts of India ".

The Tirukkural already enjoys the reputation of being, next to the Bible, the book *par excellence* that has been sought after in translations into the greatest number of languages of the world, and the languages of India have not been completely unaffected in their efforts in this matter. But it must be admitted, this epitome of the wisdom of the South has not so far been presented to the North in the due sense of proportion and in the proper setting that it deserves. If modern India is to appreciate it in the right spirit, it must be interpreted in its due perspective as the chief luminary in the galaxy of the ancient Southern classics throwing its full splendour on the exceptionally rich variety of the literary wealth of the multifarious linguistic regions of India.

The erudite and thought-provoking edition of a Hindi translation of the illustrious *Kural* has recently been brought out by Sahitya Ratna Dr. S. Shankar Raju Naidu, Head of the Department of Hindi in the Madras University, with the text side by side with the prose reading of the original on opposite sides and with a scholarly introduction by the distinguished translator himself and a Foreword from no less a person than Dr. A. Lakshmanaswamy Mudaliar. It supplies a long-felt need and bids fair to go a great way towards fulfilling the conditions above mentioned regarding the true presentation of the *Kural* to the Indian people. Further coming as it does as the proper endeavour

at the proper moment, and being undertaken as it is by one eminently fitted for the task and allured to it, one who, on the basis of the initial qualities of the work, appears to have chosen it as a life-mission and a labour of love it is alike a contribution to Tamil scholarship as to the literary world of Hindi and the history of Indian culture and thought.

Dr. Shankar Raju is on the one side a scholar, writer and critic of eminence in the Hindi world and on the other, in his own capacity, the scion of a family that has for generations taken ardently to the traditions of Tamil literature and poetry. His acquaintance with the best of the literary wealth of the West and his knowledge of the living traditions for the languages and literatures of South India in addition to that of Hindi has stood him in good stead in this task. Further he has had the rare opportunity of an intimate contact with a leader of the Tamil world of letters and thought in the person of Dr. R. P. Sethu Pillai, the Head of the Tamil Department of the University of Madras.

The translation is advisedly done in prose, in the simple current form of Hindi graced with a literary, idiomatic and racy style that adds remarkably to clarity of thought and forcefulness of expression. It may be mentioned here that the translation has a mastery of the poetic as well as the prose idiom of the Hindi language and has in both the remarkable ability to render the terse maxims of the *Kural* in an equally terse Hindi style. The wonderful felicity of his versified idiom in this respect is shown by the verse renderings of Tamil verses in the introduction in parallel Hindi form, transplanting the very rhythm and prosodial pattern of the original as faithfully as the thought expressed in them. We may cite for instance :

தெய்வந் தொழாஅள் கொழுநற் றொழுதெழுவாள்
பெய்யெனப் பெய்யும் மழை.

of Kural into its parallel Hindi verse rendering—

ईश न, नित उठ पूजै पति को,
बरसो कह दे तो बरसे।

and other successful Hindi renderings of poems from *Tiruvalluvar Malai.* Translation from Tamil of *Tirukkural* to any other language in prose or in poetic verse form, has always set a very hard problem to writers, South and West. So far translators of the *Kural* have perforce had recourse in this matter to verbose and lengthy renderings that take by far more space than the original in order to bring out its full force. Differences of interpretation among the Tamil commentators and authorities have often necessitated alternate renderings where the translators feel the necessity and this has often clogged the path of those who wished to present a clear picture of the thought of the original in the translated medium. Occasionally the native idiom could not be presented to an alien public without elaboration of the etymological or cultural background against which the terms have to be understood. But it is a mark of the excellence of the art of translation achieved by Dr. Shankar Raju that he has to a very great extent steered clear of all these difficulties. With a rare insight born of his wide acquaintance with Tamil culture and with the invaluable help of the master-mind of his illustrious guide, Dr. R. P. Sethu Pillai, he has often succeeded in bringing out the heart of Tiruvalluvar himself in one hit with a straight and simple rendering. As a result the Hindi rendering as set against the Tamil origins in the opposite page occupies more or less the space as the latter and yet to the Tamil knowing Hindi reader, the translation is a faithful echo of the thoughts of the great author of the *Kural.*

We may cite the following as evidence in this respect :

Chapter IV, Verse 1.

சிறப்புஈனும், செல்வமும் ஈனும்; அறத்தினூஉங்கு
ஆக்கம் எவனோ உயிர்க்கு?

धर्म यशप्रद है, और धनप्रद भी है। अतः जीवन के लिये धर्म से श्रेष्ठ और कौन सा पदार्थ है?

Chapter XI, Verse 2.

எண்என்ப ஏனை எழுத்தென்ப இவ்விரண்டும்
கண்என்ப வாழும் உயிர்க்கு.

अंक और अक्षर कहलानेवाले दोनों जीवित प्राणिमात्र के नेत्र कहलाते हैं।

For perspicacity as well as refined grace of style that does honour to the poetic beauty of the original, the following may be added :

Chapter CX, Verse 1.

இருநோக்கு இவள்உண்கண் உள்ளது ஒருநோக்கு
நோய்நோக்கு,ஒன்று அந்நோய் மருந்து.

इसके अंजन-रंजित नयनों में दो प्रकार की दृष्टि हैं ; एक ज्वर उत्पन्न करनेवाली और दूसरी उस ज्वर की औषधि।

The translator's introduction, no less than the admirable Foreword, supplies the Hindi reading public with the proper incentive to the appreciation and evaluation of the work. The author gives a full length critique of the life and times of the author, the social, religious and cultural background against which the inimitable world-teacher is to be understood, with proper excerpts from the criticisms bearing upon the work in the hands of savants of both East and West. He takes great pains to present the author to the Hindi public with comparisons and contrasts to the lives and thoughts of masters in Hindi like Kabir, Sur and Tulasi, and other great minds in India and abroad. He faithfully records all the traditions, legendary or otherwise about Tiruvalluvar that have accrued in the centuries in the Tamil country but he takes care to point out their flimsy nature, comparing them with the equally untenable fond traditions of other Indian poets like Kalidasa, Bhavabhuti and Kabir.

The translator has an instructive and inspiring note on the universality of appeal of Tiruvalluvar in the very outset of his Introduction.

"Great thinkers of the various languages of the world have tried to formulate through the garb of their own modes of thinking the central reality for human life.... But in all the literatures of the world we find quite a limited number of masters indeed, who have depicted the unknown through the known and who with a mind broad enough for the purpose, have risen above the limitations of space and time, and through illuminating them, have shown what is true to all countries and all periods. We can find a handful of great men in this land of Bharata, who have achieved this rare task. They have set up a glaring ideal for all humanity to follow. Among these very few we have to count Tiruvalluvar who has verily shown to our view the true form of Bharata! Those who search for the reality of ancient Bharata will find this true thought pervading all Bharata in a latent form."

It is gratifying to note that this edition brought out by the University of Madras is the first Hindi translation of *Tirukkural* directly from the Tamil original. It is endowed in addition to the Introduction and Foreword, with an index of the first lines of the text and a table of the Tamil alphabets with Hindi equivalents enabling the Hindi readers to go through the very original wordings of Tiruvalluvar.

The publication of this edition of *Tirukkural* with the Hindi translation is a step in the right direction for a proper appreciation of the *Kural* in India and we hope it will be followed up with similar attempts in the cause of other Tamil classics as well, undertaken by the University as well as by the Government agencies through hands as fitted to the task as that of the learned translator.

K. A.

BOOK RECEIVED

அச்சுக்கலை — மா. சு. சம்பந்தம், பக்கங்கள் 240, விலை ரூ. 6.00. தமிழர் பதிப்பகம், 81, லிங்கா செட்டித் தெரு, சென்னை - 1. விற்பனை உரிமை: பாரி நிலையம், 59, பிராட்வே, சென்னை-1.

TAMIL CULTURE

Statement about ownership and other particulars about Newspaper *TAMIL CULTURE* to be published in the first issue every year after the last day of February.

. FORM IV (See Rule 8)

1. Place of Publication :	Madras.
2. Periodicity of its publication :	Quarterly.
3. Printer's Name :	K. S. S. Rajan.
Nationality :	Indian.
Address :	The Jupiter Press Private Ltd., 109-C, Mount Road, Madras-18.
4. Publisher's Name :	Sri C. Amritaganesan, Hony. Secretary, Academy of Tamil Culture, Madras-7.
Nationality :	Indian.
Address :	12, Monteith Road, Egmore, Madras-7.
5. Editor's Name :	Sri C. Amritaganesan, Hony. Secretary, Academy of Tamil Culture, Madras-7.
Nationality :	Indian.
Address :	12, Monteith Road, Egmore, Madras-7.
6. Names and addresses of individuals who own the newspaper and partners or shareholders holding more than one per cent of the total capital :	Academy of Tamil Culture, Madras-7.

I, C. Amritaganesan, hereby declare that the particulars given above are true to the best of my knowledge and belief.

C. AMRITAGANESAN,
Publisher.

Date : 1st April 1961.

ACADEMY OF TAMIL CULTURE

(Continued from inside front cover)

TAMIL CULTURE

Subscriptions, advertisements, and remittances should be addressed to: The Manager, *Tamil Culture,* Madras-7.

Subscriptions are best remitted in the form of crossed Postal orders or cheques or Bank drafts *payable in India* drawn in favour of *Tamil Culture.* Cheques not drawn on a Bank in Madras should include the Bank's collecting commission of 50 naye paise. V. P. P. charges are extra.

Subscriptions and remittances may also be remitted to:

CEYLON: Kalaivani Book Centre, 130, Trincomalie Street, Kandy.

MALAYA: Manager, *Tamil Murasu,* 71, Selegie Road, Singapore 7.

RATES OF SUBSCRIPTION (effective from 1956):

	India, Ceylon, Burma, Malaya	U. K.	U. S. A. & other countries
Annual	**Rs. 7**	**Sh. 12/6**	**U. S. $ 2·00** or its equivalent
Single Copy	**Rs. 2**	**Sh. 4**	**U. S. $ 0·75.**

As back numbers are usually sold out, we are unable to guarantee supply of back numbers to subscribers who send their subscriptions for any year after one or more issues for that year are published. In such cases we can supply only subsequent issues of the year at single copy rates. Subscribers are therefore requested to send their subscriptions, new or renewals, to reach us by 31st December.

Literary communications, Exchange, and Books for review should be addressed to the Chief Editor, *Tamil Culture,* Madras-7.

To secure their return, if not accepted, the Mss. offered for publication should be accompanied by a stamped addressed envelope. The Editor does not take any responsibility for Mss. that may be lost. Mss. should be typewritten and sent in duplicate to facilitate printing.

The expression of individual views by contributors or reviewers does not imply editorial endorsement.

Published by Mr. C. Amritaganesan for Academy of Tamil Culture, Madras-7 and printed by K. S. S. Rajan at The Jupiter Press Private Ltd., 109-C, Mount Road, Madras-18.